Southern State Normal School Library
Springfield, S. Dak.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. 109, NO. 13 NEW YORK, MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 1943 NUMBER 1504

Weaving the Pattern of Victory

Another momentous week in world history has come to an end. Perhaps most important of all was the continued amazing success of the Russian army. Even if you assume that the Germans have decided to fall back for strategic reasons to the borders of Poland and Rumania, the Russian achievement is still magnificent, since the Germans are obviously in distress, and the Russians continue to press them with a strength that indicates remarkable organization of the services of supply.

In Italy the first danger to our forces on the beach at Salerno—danger apparently due to faulty intelligence work on our part—has been ended. The Germans, by September 20, were being pushed back all along the line. Sardinia fell into our hands almost without a struggle, and there was grave question whether the Germans could continue to hold Corsica. The whole Balkans seemed to be on fire and there were sensational reports that the Yugoslav guerrillas had conquered much of the eastern coastline of the Adriatic. Unconfirmed stories from Turkey said large units of the British Ninth Army, from the Middle East, had embarked for an unknown destination.

In the Far Eastern theatre, the capture of Lae and Salamaua was accompanied by new raids on Japanese islands in the Gilbert group far to the east, and by sharp air battles in the Solomons. All signs pointed to an early and vigorous assault on Burma.

Politically, the week's report seemed brighter than usual. A conference of Foreign Ministers of the United States, Great Britain and Russia will be held, probably in Moscow. Russia is included in the special Mediterranean committee. Our Ambassador to Moscow, Admiral Standley, is coming home, and perhaps will be replaced by someone more tactful in his attitude toward the Russians. With the Pope virtually a Nazi prisoner in the Vatican, Russia has made peace, formally at least, with the Greek Orthodox Church.

Questions About Italy

The temporary check at Salerno, the heavy loss of American and British lives, the tedious progress of the Italian campaign, for which the prospects were so bright—all this raises a number of questions regarding our political as well as our military policy in Europe. Did we need to wait so many weeks after the fall of Mussolini before beginning our invasion of Italian soil? Did we have to give the Germans time to concentrate their armored divisions against our likeliest beachheads? Couldn't we have prevented their seizing Mussolini? Why didn't we make contact with those Italians who are willing to fight the Germans to the death? Did we have to send so many night bombers over Turin and Milan, where the workers are revolutionary and hate the Nazis? Precision bombing by day could have crippled the war factories. The result of area bombing by night was that we dispersed our friends into the countryside—besides killing thousands of them—and made it easier for the Germans to capture both cities. Have we dropped military supplies by parachute in those northern districts which, by first-hand accounts last week, were still resisting? If not, why not? And, if the answer is that we didn't know the temper of the Italians, or know which towns or provinces would fight

CONTENTS

The Week 407

Editorials
- America and European Reaction 410
- Democracy in China 412

General Articles
- What to Do with Germany . . George Soule 413
- The Price of Tory Victory . . . . . The Tribune (London) 415
- The Literary Business in 1943 . . . . . Malcolm Cowley 417
- National Service Is Here . . Helen Fuller 419
- Salute to Bob Lovett . . Jefferson B. Fletcher 420
- Soldiers' Prose . . . . . G. I. 423
- Washington Notes . . . . . T. R. B. 425
- Love in the Foxholes . . . Manny Farber 426
- The Ham Hangs High . . . Stark Young 426
- The Bandwagon 427

Correspondence 427

Books in Review
- What Is to Be Done . . . . . Jay Allen 430
- The Past Recaptured . . . Marianne Moore 431
- Two Views of America . . George Mayberry 432
- India Today . . . . . Anup Singh 433
- Pre-Paid Medicine . . . . . B. B. 434
- A Reader's List 434

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1943, IN THE U.S.A. BY EDITORIAL PUBLICATIONS, INC., 40 EAST 49 ST., NEW YORK 17, N. Y.
ENTERED AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on our side, why didn't we know? Was it because we were afraid to trust the Italian exiles, many of whom would have been glad to reënter the country and send us information at the risk of their lives?

We do not ask these questions in any dogmatic spirit. We realize that it is difficult or impossible for civilians in this country to picture the choices actually open to a military commander at the front. General Eisenhower has shown himself to be a superb planner and organizer and a bluff, capable diplomat. In this case, however, it begins to look as though he or his political advisers, in Algiers or Washington, have failed to take full advantage of the biggest opportunity so far presented to us.

Congress and World Organization

The favorable attitude of Congress toward the Fulbright Resolution makes it almost certain that both Houses will fairly soon be on record as favoring American membership in an international organization to keep the peace. In a recent press conference, Sen. Tom Connally, chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, formally pledged himself to introduce a Senate resolution which will be more far-reaching and more definite than that in the House. Connally indicated that his bill would favor backing up an international organization with the economic and military powers necessary to preserve it, but would not favor an international police force. He also repeated that he and his committee, a subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee set up to consider post-war proposals, would not be in any hurry to act, thus confirming the fears of those who want prompt Senate action to show the world where we stand now. Meanwhile, the more satisfactory Ball-Burton-Hill-Hatch Resolution, which includes an international police force, continues to pile up support all over the country. Senators who are being flooded with mail supporting this bill are now saying that unless Connally's committee makes its report soon, steps will have to be taken to remove this important assignment from its hands.

Made in the USA

The President included some staggering facts of war production in his message to Congress. Since May, 1940, we have produced, among other items, 123,000 airplanes, 349,000 airplane engines, 9,500,000 small arms and 25,942,000,000 rounds of ammunition. We like to remember the awe which greeted the President's first statement of our military requirements. In most categories those "astronomical" figures have been met and surpassed—astronomy no longer can offer us suitable parallels to our arms production.

Production of naval vessels and equipment is also going on at a great rate. We have completed 2,380 fighting ships and auxiliaries and 13,000 landing vessels since May, 1940. The power plants installed in our ships in the last two and a half years alone have a horsepower equal to all the hydroelectric plants operating in the United States in January, 1941. These facts, together with the record of our shipbuilding program, the victory over the U-boat and the acquisition of the Italian fleet which will release American and British ships for other invasion duties and for action against Japan, completely establish our superiority over the Axis in all branches of warfare.

An interesting footnote to the production record occurs to us. Fifteen thousand planes and 281 merchant ships, to a total of 3,200,000 tons, were produced during the two months that Congress was in recess. We are not suggesting a connection—but would that our political record were also staggering enough to invite comparison with the stars.

Drafting Fathers

It is regrettable that the most important popular issue that has arisen from the difficult manpower crisis is whether or not we should draft fathers. As we have said before, logic, not sentiment, should decide the issue, and men should be put in uniform or left in the factories or on the farms on the basis of their greatest usefulness, not on the basis of their family relationships. But as more and more heads of families are taken into the armed forces, a just and adequate method of supporting their dependents must be established. Had this been done, we are certain that much of the popular opposition to drafting fathers would have diminished. A recent Gallup Poll reports the disturbing fact that 68 percent of the people favor drafting single men in war industries before drafting fathers, and the problem of support for dependents undoubtedly played a part in this result.

The President Speaks Out

President Roosevelt deserves the warmest praise for his courageous action in regard to three government officials whom the House of Representatives has tried to force out of public office. These three men, Robert Morss Lovett, Goodwin Watson and William E. Dodd Jr., had fallen under the roving and singularly myopic eye of Rep. Martin Dies. The House, in one of the most disgraceful actions of the past few decades, tried to dismiss these three officials through a virtual bill of attainder, which is specifically forbidden by the United States Constitution. The Senate repeatedly refused to fall in with this disgraceful effort, so the House attached the provisions to an urgent deficiency bill which had to be passed in order to keep congressmen's own secretaries and doorkeepers on the job. The Senate, thus blackmailed, reluctantly agreed that the three men should be removed unless, before November 15, they are nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate. In the case of Mr. Lovett, funds for his post,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that of Government Secretary of the Virgin Islands, were stricken out of the Interior Department appropriation bill.

President Roosevelt has now described this action in the language it deserved. In a message to Congress he has called it an unwarranted encroachment upon the authority of the executive and judicial branches, not binding upon them. He says it is "unwise, discriminatory and unconstitutional," and points out that "no judicial trials have been held; no impeachment proceedings have been instituted." This is the old Roosevelt; no one could ask for any better. Representative Dies has certainly blundered, in our opinion, in openly attacking the President. Dies said Mr. Roosevelt's statement "smacks of dictatorship." We believe the majority of the American people on this issue will side with President Roosevelt and with fair play, not with Mr. Dies.

Holy Russia

The Russian Orthodox Church has been restored to its full measure of pomp and glory, with the recent investiture of Metropolitan Sergius as Patriarch of All Russia. So ends Godlessness as an official state doctrine in Russia. During most of the time since 1917, it was not enforced rigorously. The churches were open, and were filled with communicants. The rising generation, however, was trained in atheism and on the whole, the church has been fighting a losing battle.

Why was the new move undertaken? Not, you may be sure, because Stalin and those about him have suffered any change of heart. The move is political, not religious. In part, it is an offset to the deep hostility of the Roman Catholic Church, which has recently been broadcasting, in Russian, from Vatican City, in terms hostile to the Moscow government. In part, it is a sop to the religious sensibilities of the Western democracies. In part, it is a recognition of the rising nationalism within Russia, the revived interest in her history and institutions.

The ALP in Brooklyn

It is good news, in our judgment, that the Brooklyn Supreme Court has ordered the American Labor Party in that area to hold another organization meeting in place of the one of August 30. The so-called "right wing" of the ALP controlled this meeting and elected its candidates; but independent witnesses who were present indicate substantial doubt about the legality of the proceedings. The New Republic is in general sympathy with the right wing and we recognize that the Communists, who dominate the left wing, have frequently in the past acted just as badly or worse. Nevertheless we feel it is of great importance that no shadow of illegality should cloud the title of the right wing; it would be better to lose this election and wait for another chance. The only real asset liberals have is their honesty; in everything else our enemies are better equipped than we are—in numbers, discipline, money and brazen unscrupulousness. Let's stick to our asset.

Stupid Union Leadership

A short time ago there was a bad shortage of labor in a tomato-raising district in southern New Jersey. A number of soldiers from a nearby camp volunteered to work in a cannery and save the crop. Now it is revealed that a local labor union collected small dues—apparently about twenty-five cents a head—from each of these soldiers. For incredible stupidity and blindness to public opinion, this episode certainly deserves the booby prize. It will be used all over the country by labor-baiters as an argument that unions are unpatriotic, care nothing about the nation's food and are just a bunch of racketeers. You may be sure it will be heard over and over again in Congress. This union is affiliated with the American Federation of Labor and we hope President William Green will also have enough intelligence and courage to say publicly what he thinks of the action. We were happy to see that Vincent J. Murphy, Democratic candidate for Governor and secretary of the State Federation of Labor, vigorously denounced the action.

Black Markets Preferred

If the Republicans were counting on Frank Gannett's National Food Conference in Chicago to open their attack on the administration's food program, they will have to count again, for that little bomb, timed to coincide with the reopening of Congress, fizzled out. A good many representatives of state commissioners of agriculture turned up, together with several discredited public figures of a few years ago.

The editor of Pennsylvanian Joe Pew's Farm Journal had a lot to say about what a mess the administra-

Bishop in The St. Louis Star-Times

Prospect for the Year V

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion has been making of practically everything, and Sen. Harlan Bushfield of South Dakota, whose campaign funds were largely provided by Pews and duPonts, came out for black marketing. Bushfield was reminiscent about prohibition, when "we developed a workable and businesslike system of evading the law," and promised with regard to the present that "if the planners will chart a master plan to remake America and publish it, we can then go ahead building our bootleg organization with some degree of security." Sen. "Pappy" O'Daniel delivered his routine anti-labor harangue, and Lou Maxon of Detroit (once of the OPA) spoke for advertisers. But a little-noticed fat man was probably more important than any of these. Ralph Moore, veteran farm-bloc lobbyist from Texas, by his own claim was the "arms and legs" of the Gannett conference. As such we may expect to hear more from him. Especially since he made it clear that his opposition to the food program would be in terms of his idea that "President Roosevelt is more akin to communism than to the Republic." His idea of a specific food program, presumably for after the Gannett conference as well as before, is "to break price ceilings and abolish the OPA."

Fair Employment on Railroads

The most recent series of hearings before the newly reorganized Fair Employment Practice Committee proves that all the talk months ago about railroad discrimination against Negro workers was probably fully justified. Twenty-two of the major railroads of the United States have been accused of personnel practices which contribute to racial discrimination, in that Negroes are barred from any but menial jobs. The New York Central, the Pennsylvania and the Baltimore and Ohio are included in the group which contends that their policies are justifiable because they reflect the local customs and standards of the regions in which the roads operate.

The most important fact in the situation is that the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers is now in the process of dropping all Negroes holding jobs which fall within its jurisdiction. The primary problem of the current hearings is what to do about this. Herbert Northrup, who testified on the first day of the current hearings, summarized the problem very well: "The Negro has become a pawn in industrial relations; employers have used him to fight unions and to depress wages; unions have retaliated by attempting either to limit the employment of Negroes or by driving those already employed from the railroads."

How Not to Win Friends

The Columbia Broadcasting System in a full-page newspaper advertisement explains that it will not permit its news broadcasters to "opinionate" the news. Whatever the merit or lack of merit in the proposal, our guess is that radio listeners will not be content with a mere recital of news and will turn in increasingly large numbers to news "analysts" on other stations. And incidentally, if the networks are going to be so careful about statements by their news reporters, we wish they would be a little more careful about statements by their advertisers, many of which would not stand the test of scientific accuracy which radio now seems to want to apply.

General Dismay and General Laughter

With the press in Argentina subject to strict military censorship, the public has taken to expressing its political opinions in the form of jokes, exactly like the Italian public under Mussolini. Friends back from Buenos Aires have told us some of them. The first concerns Santamarina, the Minister of Finance, who is the only civilian in General Ramirez's Cabinet. Porteños call him the Daughter of the Regiment—but the word they use is somewhat less printable than "daughter." They also say that there are only two generals in Buenos Aires who favor the United States: General Motors and General Electric. The only general who defends the Argentine public is general laughter. It is a good thing the other generals are attempting to militarize the civilians, since it would be impossible to civilize the military.

The last story is not funny at all, when you think of what it implies. Liberals in Buenos Aires are thanking their stars that the dictatorship is opposed to the United States. They say that if it were in the good graces of the State Department, they would never get rid of it.

America and European Reaction

WE PRINT ELSEWHERE in this issue an article from The London Tribune which has increasingly become the authentic voice of the militant labor and democratic forces in England. It says some very harsh things about the policy of the British government toward the political decisions that are being reached in Europe today. But many of our readers will recognize, in the mirror of British policy thus presented, the image of American policy as well. The story is about our ruling groups just as much as about the British.

As we approach victory over the Germans, the issue about the future that emerges with ever greater clearness may be stated somewhat as follows. Will we use our victory to suppress the democratic revolutions in Europe? Will America and Britain become another Holy Alliance, to act as watchdogs over the European status quo? It would be a matter of cruel irony if this should prove true, as far as Americans are concerned—if the nation which cradled the democratic revolutions

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the world should today become a bastion of counter-revolution.

President Roosevelt is evidently growing more and more anxious to reassure American progressives and American labor on this score. The whole episode of negotiations with Badoglio has been handled with infinitely more subtlety and restraint than the Darlan episode. In his message to Congress last week, Mr. Roosevelt pleaded with the American people to bear with him, and to suspend judgment on his political policies in Europe until he could afford to tell all without giving the enemy military information. He told them that they could be "sure that the policy which we follow is an expression of the basic democratic traditions and ideals of this Republic," and that there would be no victory "if any vestige of fascism in any of its malignant forms is permitted to survive in the world."

As generalizations, these words are reassuring. But generalizations are not enough, nor are words. While we can suspend final judgment until all the returns are in, we cannot suspend our critical faculties merely because the President assures us that all will be well in the end. In the field of foreign policy, from Spain to China, Mr. Roosevelt's record has not been a shining one, nor have his judgments of popular movements outside America been particularly astute. American liberals would be lacking in elementary wisdom and dignity if they took our political decisions in Europe on faith—if they did not understand the high stakes, and the terrible dangers in those decisions, and the insistent pressures that push them in the direction of reaction.

The bitter fact is that the ruling groups in both England and America have fought the war out of fear rather than out of belief—fear for their survival rather than a basic hatred of fascism and belief in democracy's possibilities. And as the war has been fought out of fear, so the peace is being built in a spirit of fear—fear of the revolutionary possibilities of European democracy.

The case of Italy is a good example. Evidently Mr. Roosevelt regards it with pride as a great improvement on the case of North Africa, and no doubt it is. Yet to say that is mainly to say how pitiable the whole North African muddle was. Nothing has been done to show that we understand the complete social and constitutional change that the democratic forces in Italy yearn for. All of our negotiations have thus far been with the milder Fascists like Badoglio. We have sought no symbol for the Italian people to rally around except the negative one of invoking their hatred of the Germans. We have given them no lift of the spirit, no sense of being allied in a common effort to find a New Deal for the submerged and exploited peoples of the world.

To be sure, we have the plea of military necessity. Just what relation there could be between military necessity and the encouragement of Italy's democratic forces seems very obscure. Yet, however, that may be, there will always be the plea of military necessity. Thus far the argument has been that we could not encourage an Italian revolution because it would have frightened off Badoglio and the King, and so we could not have had the Italian navy. Now the argument will be that we need to unite all Italians, including the Fascists, in a common effort to drive the Nazis out of Italy. And when they are driven out, the argument will then be that we cannot risk instability in Italy because we must use Italy as an air-base for attacks on Hitler's fortress, and as a shipping base for invasions of the Balkans and southern France.

Things will always be done on the plea of military necessity that make no sense in political terms. It might be well to remember that in a democracy the army is the servant, not the master, of our policy.

Given this fear of European revolution, much else about the present direction of Anglo-American policy becomes clear. It explains our fear of Russia—for if Russia remains powerful in post-war Europe, it will give the democratic movements everywhere in Europe shelter against the rough winds of counter-revolution. It explains our attitude to the French Committee of National Liberation. And it explains the attempts to forge a closer alliance between England and America in the post-war world.

There is everything to be said for such an alliance, if it were closely linked with a similar alliance with the Soviet Union and were part of a worldwide organization. By itself it seems mainly calculated to form an Anglo-Saxon bloc to offset Russia's power and to crush or prevent the democratic revolutions in Europe. The very revealing article, "The British Get Out of the Doghouse," in The Saturday Evening Post, by Forrest Davis, who has generally had an inside track to State Department intent, indicates that the proposed alliance is for the purpose of preventing the "bolshevizing" of Europe. And thus far Secretary Hull has not slapped Forrest Davis down, as he did Drew Pearson.

We believe this policy will defeat itself. For to suppress the revolutionary impulses in Europe means to dam them up temporarily, only to have them break out all the more violently when the lid is removed. Even on the assumption that what Europe needs most is political and social stability, the British and Americans have been acting foolishly. They have been acting on a false premise as to what brings stability. Given the deep revolutionary urge in Europe now, stability can be achieved only by healthy social change, not by freezing the status quo.

As the Red Queen puts it to Alice, you have to run awful fast if you want to stay in the same place.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Democracy in China

WITHIN ONE YEAR after the war ends, China is to have a democratic constitutional government. This news of world importance came too late for more than brief comment in these columns last week. Now, with full details from Chungking, it is clear that another major triumph over fascism has been won, under the personal leadership of Chiang Kai-shek.

For China has been under totalitarian rule—that is, under a one-party government. Chiang Kai-shek has been leader of that party, the Kuomintang, since 1927, and has been a wartime dictator since 1937. The seeds and some of the growths of fascism were there. At times, when the shifts of war or politics abroad sent winds to favor them, there was real danger that they would flourish and spread. Japan well knew this, and again and again made ready for the harvest. Now the Chinese are telling us pointedly that in recent months they have rejected several peace feelers from Japan. China is at last irrevocably lined up on the side of the Allies, and of democracy.

In his opening speech to the Kuomintang session—not given out until some days later—Chiang Kai-shek said that the most important phase of national reconstruction is the enforcement of constitutional government. He said that the Kuomintang should then "hand over the government to the people" and "take its place on equal footing with other ordinary parties and common citizens, enjoying equal privileges and rights, fulfilling equal obligations and receiving equal treatment from the state under the principles of freedom of assembly, organization, speech and publication in accordance with law."

After the Kuomintang committee had voted that a National Congress shall be called within one year after the end of the war, to adopt a constitution, Chiang spoke again. He said that the Chinese Communist problem is purely political and should be solved by political means. He called for "leniency and forebearance" toward the Communists, but "hoped" that they would disband their armed forces and incorporate them into the national army.

Besides the Communists, there are several other "smaller" parties that have kept alive in China, in spite of the ban against political opposition, which with true Chinese reasonableness has never been strictly applied. They include the Third Party, the Young China Party, the National Socialists (no relation to the German Nazis), the National Salvation Association and the Rural Reconstructionists. These and some other groups are loosely banded together in a Federation for Political Democracy. They have a program. In them, with or without the Communists, may lie the promise that when democratic government comes, there will be a genuine opposition to the Kuomintang.

There is plenty of other groundwork for democracy in China. Even under the Emperors the people were always individualists, and largely self-governing through their family system and the village magistrates. James Yen likes to quote the ancient farmer's song:

> When the sun rises, I work.
> When the sun sets, I rest.
> I dig the well to drink,
> I plow the field to eat.
> What has the Emperor to do with me?

Members of the Kuomintang insist that it has never claimed the right of dictatorship, that it is a democratic party, having started the revolution of 1911 that overthrew the Manchus, and is committed to the principles of the people laid down by Sun Yat-sen—"the people to have, the people to rule, the people to enjoy."

Before 1937 a constitution was drafted. The National Assembly called to adopt it was canceled because of the war. Instead, a People's Political Council was set up in 1938, to act as an advisory and "semi-legislative" popular assembly. Members of all the "smaller" parties, including the Communists, have sat and spoken in this Council, and it has often been quite bold in the advice it has given.

Finally, a new system of self-government, the *hsien* system, has been widely developed in Free China during the war. These *hsien* governments are very close to the people, are often headed by trained men who have displaced the old magistrates, and are giving the farmers an increasing share in the running of local affairs.

China is almost ready, then, to close the transitional period of "political tutelage" and to enter that of constitutional government. Let none of us in the West, being skeptical or unsure of where we stand ourselves, cast doubts upon the sincerity of Chiang Kai-shek and his party. This is a time not only for great deeds in China but also for great faith in China.

THE NEW REPUBLIC
A Journal of Opinion

Editors: BRUCE BLIVEN, MALCOLM COWLEY, GEORGE SOULE, MICHAEL STRAIGHT, STARK YOUNG

Managing Editor: THOMAS SANCTON

Treasurer: DANIEL MEBANE

Assistant Editors: ELIZABETH HULING, GEORGE MAYBERRY, ISAAC ROSENFELD

Contributing Editors: H. N. BRAILSFORD, VAN WYCK BROOKS, VARIAN FRY, JULIAN HUXLEY, ALFRED KAZIN, MAX LERNER, E. C. LINDEMAN, REXFORD GUY TUGWELL

Advertising Manager: E. G. WOOD

SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN SUBSCRIPTION, SIX DOLLARS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Southern State Normal School Library
Springfield, S. Dak.

What to Do with Germany

IF THERE ARE DISAGREEMENTS about war strategy between Britain and the United States on one side and Russia on the other, it may be taken for granted that on one fundamental peace aim they are and will remain united—that Germany shall henceforth be rendered safe for the rest of the world. This will undoubtedly be first also among the requirements of the liberated nations of Europe. But concerning how this objective is to be achieved there are many conflicting opinions, and much honest doubt among those not yet convinced that any good solution has been advanced.

First of all, people begin to question the requirement of unconditional surrender. This does not go to the extent, usually, of advocating a negotiated peace, if the negotiation is to be with any forces in Germany held responsible for the war, such as the Nazis or the army. But those who ask the question point out that the demand for unconditional surrender is used by the German war machine to convince Germans that the Allies desire their total destruction and hence that there is no alternative but to fight to the end under their present leadership. In addition, it may actually mean a Carthaginian peace, which the doubters believe incompatible with the aim of making Germans into good neighbors—assuming that it would be impossible to kill off 80,000,000 Germans or carry them into permanent captivity.

Here some useful distinctions may be made. Suppose, before the war is fought to a finish, a German revolution should create a government based on anti-Nazi and non-militaristic elements. This now seems unlikely, but it is possible, especially if such a development were encouraged by the Allies. It seems to be contemplated, for instance, by the manifesto of German prisoners to which Moscow has given implied approval. Would it be wise to continue to demand unconditional surrender from such a government?

We did make peace with a revolutionary government last time, and the results were unfortunate. The army preserved itself, at least as a nucleus, under the mask of the Reichswehr. Many Germans accepted the face-saving doctrine that Germany was never defeated in the field, but was betrayed from within. The liberal and pacifist government which accepted peace was made to bear the onus of disgrace, and this prepared the way for Hitler and the remilitarization of the nation.

This time the Germans must be left in no doubt that further resistance would be hopeless. If surrender should come from Hitler or any Nazi successor, without conditions, that would be an excellent outcome. Surrender by any army-dominated government which succeeded him would be as good. The dilemma would arise only if an apparently democratic government should come into power before Germany was really defeated in the field. In that case unconditional surrender should still be demanded, but should be accepted only from responsible commanders of the army. In other words, we should not deal with any German government—and especially not with one which we hoped to keep in power—before the army had surrendered unconditionally, it was clear to all that Germany had been utterly defeated by military power, and the defeat had been acknowledged by the officer caste. The legend that German arms are invincible must be destroyed for all time.

However peace comes, punishment of those guilty of causing the war and of atrocities during its course is almost universally demanded. If not executed by the Germans themselves before the end of the war, this punishment should be administered by the Allies, after judicial process, as an act of international justice. The efficacy of punishment even by society is questionable in a civilized world, but unfortunately the perpetrators of these monstrous crimes have created an atmosphere of savagery in which more merciful standards are utopian. The victims who are still alive cannot forgive, the Germans will not understand remission of punishment as anything but weakness and folly, and public justice is a long step ahead of private vengeance.

By harsh means such as these, a foundation may be laid for convincing the Germans that they are not a superior race in military prowess, that aggressive war cannot succeed and will not pay. There remains the task of creating a peace in which they will have neither the will nor the power to try it again with greater hope of success.

One favorite formula is partition of Germany into independent states, in the hope that thus Prussian military dominance would be ended, and the states could not again get together to wage war. This formula has two fatal defects. First, it would emphasize the sense of German inferiority out of which has grown in the past the overvaluation of national unity and a belief in the necessity of war to achieve it. This feeling has many times been used by German militarists, and not least by Hitler himself. Second, it would freeze separatism in the heart of a continental region, the popular welfare of which requires union, especially economic union. One of the main faults of the last peace was fragmentation of Europe into too many sovereign states.

Another favorite formula is federation of groups of liberated nations into larger units which would be capable of offering greater resistance if Germany should attack them. Such federation may be desirable for other reasons, but would scarcely be adequate for the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

purpose in view. No Eastern European or Balkan federation, for instance, would be likely to be more powerful than France in 1939, and yet Germany did not hesitate to attack France and Britain combined. In addition, Russia opposes such federations, fearing they may be directed against her, and they are not likely to be formed in the face of Russian opposition.

The case for general European federation, absorbing the Germans in a larger unit in which non-Germans, if combined against them, would hold a strong majority, was ably argued in a recent issue of The New Republic by Albert Guérard. In spite of its merits, this solution is not likely to be adopted by the victors. Russia would probably oppose it, not wishing to have a neighbor which, if hostile, would be able to muster even more military power than the Axis itself. Britain has evinced no enthusiasm for it, and it would create embarrassing questions for her, such as whether she could afford either to be or not to be a member. It is difficult to imagine the United States, with its present State Department and its recent background of isolationism, trying to impose such a solution against the will of Britain and Russia, or succeeding if it tried. The development could come, I believe, only as a result of revolution by the European peoples themselves, but at present the possible revolutionaries seem to be more nationally oriented than before the war; they have become the champions of national honor and prestige, especially in the nations subdued by Germany.

It seems likely, then, that Germany will have to be reconstituted as a nation. Trimming of boundaries may be made, but no trimming could deprive her of the power to make war, while too much could set up the same old grievances. The victors could dictate disarmament, at least for a time. A revolutionary democratic government could and probably would, after the discrediting of the old officer caste, deprive it of power. But Germans would still have to be convinced in practice that if they behaved in a coöperative and peaceful way they could live a satisfactory life, ultimately on terms of equality with the rest of the peoples. And at the same time the rest of the world would have to be assured that German industrial strength would not be used as the basis of new military adventures. These two aims seem to conflict; yet a satisfactory solution cannot be found if either is discarded.

Here is where the biggest mistake is likely to be made. Some hold that the destruction incident to the war itself will wipe out German industrial equipment. But either the equipment will be rebuilt, and thus Germany will acquire the advantage of a thoroughly modernized installation, such as brought prosperity to northern France after the last war, or Germans will be robbed of the high productiveness necessary to sustain a modern industrial nation at an acceptable standard of living, one which is is necessary indeed for the prosperity of its neighbors.

A semi-official proposal has been put forward in this country that German industry be "decentralized" and thus made ineffectual as a means of munitions manufacture. But this, in the sense intended, would be equivalent to leaving her in ruins and robbing the people of productiveness. Some who recognize the fallacy of this solution have proposed retaining the high degree of industrial organization which has been achieved by cartellization and otherwise, but distributing the control of the cartels by introducing ownership and directors from the Allied nations. But our experience with cartels controlled by private business interests does not reassure us that they either tend toward expansion of production for a high standard of living or safeguard peace.

The only possible solution seems to lie in international organization on a worldwide basis, which has strong support in most countries. No combination in Europe alone could be sure of defeating Germany, but this war will abundantly prove that a world coalition can do so, even after Germany has been given years to prepare, has subdued most of Europe and has the help of Japan. Germany is not likely to try again, even under as favorable conditions as she enjoyed in 1939, if Britain, Russia, the USA and the other United Nations adhere to collective security and mean it.

A more energetic development of world organization could assure, moreover, that Germany would never again arrive at the motives or the means which she possessed in 1939. A united effort to maintain expanding production and consumption would prevent another depression like that of 1929, during which Hitlerism received its greatest impetus. The moderation of trade barriers and an international agency to stabilize exchanges would forestall the exclusive barter agreements by which Germany extended economic dominance in many regions, at the expense of general recovery. An international investment and developmental agency would hasten the natural growth of industry in "backward regions" and thus increase the economic resources at the command of an anti-German coalition, or indeed at the command of any nation or group of nations compelled to resist aggression by older industrial powers. Worldwide distribution of industry would have somewhat the same effect on robber nations that worldwide distribution of firearms once had on robber barons. International regulation of the distribution of scarce materials according to need could throttle at its source any German attempt to manufacture more weapons than she was allowed by international agreement—assuming she was allowed any at all—or to build up strategic reserves. At the same time, Germans could enjoy a rising standard of living, along with the rest of the world, by participating in the manufacture of capital goods necessary for expansion of production in the less developed regions, and by sharing equitably in the increased product.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I do not advocate, then, relinquishing the demand for unconditional surrender or making any specific promises to induce the installation of a German government which would surrender. Such promises were made last time, and the Germans believe they were unfulfilled. In addition, such a government would soon be thought by Germans to be dominated by foreigners. What is necessary is to formulate and announce plans for the post-war world, applying to all nations, in the benefits of which Germans would want to participate. And it would do no harm to state that they would be allowed to do so, once they had proved their fitness to be citizens of a world community. The alternative to bitter-end resistance should be presented, not as a promise to Germans, but as an assurance to all, ourselves included.

GEORGE SOULE

The Price of Tory Victory[1]

THE WAR so far has been marked by three distinct phases. The fourth is just beginning. The first was, in substance, merely a continuation of the policy which dominated the British Foreign Office from the time it became apparent that Germany was once more a military power to be reckoned with. Its central principle was the hope that Hitler would drive eastward and involve himself in a bloody struggle with the Soviet Union. Go east, young man! was the not entirely secret prayer of Mr. Chamberlain. Although officially Britain declared war upon Germany in 1939, this dying hope, and its attendant Maginot mentality, still paralyzed the Allied war effort, disordered our reasoning and debilitated our national energies.

With the collapse of France, ending in the evacuation of Dunkirk, this phase ended, and the second began. The extrovert and robust temperament of Mr. Churchill expressed it admirably. The primitive necessities of simple self-defense ideally fitted a reluctance to abstract reflection which has characterized the British since the end of the eighteenth century, and both together enabled Britain to face a grim present with all the more abandon, because the future looked too ominous to repay consideration.

Faced by the threat of extermination, political differences disappeared overnight, and a spirit of exalted cooperation seized all classes, and every field of social and political activity. It seemed to most people that all our political leaders were talking a common language when, in fact, what had happened was that they were faced by a common enemy. It was a natural self-deception, and it is one to which the governing classes of Britain are peculiarly addicted when the conditions of the moment exempt them from the need to convert the idealism of their language into political and economic practice. Mr. Churchill used the phrases of a tendentious socialism, and Mr. Anthony Eden recaptured the atmosphere of Geneva, where he won his spurious reputation as a forward-looking young statesman.

It was during this period, and under the influence of these external pressures, that people in Britain got the idea that this war was somehow different from all other wars in that it marked the automatic opening of a new social and economic advance for mankind. The opposition of the British ruling classes to Nazi Germany was confused in men's minds with opposition to fascism in general, despite the fact that British foreign policy was quite happy with fascism so long as it offered no threat to the paramounce of the British Empire. Nor were the people as a whole disturbed in their day-dream by Mr. Churchill's stubborn refusal radically to revise his Indian policy, nor by the failure to implement in equal practice the exciting promise of the Act of 1940, which put property as well as persons at the disposal of the nation. The medicinal doubts of those who did dare to voice the significance of these omissions were muted by the crash of bombs and the thunder of the anti-aircraft guns, and ordinary men and women were too much occupied with their war work, and in keeping alive, to examine too closely what was being done or not being done in their name.

With the entry of Russia and the USA into the war this defensive phase came to an end, and for the first time since we were driven from the European continent effective military offensives became possible. Russia, in particular, generated an offensive power beyond all expectations and drained the resources of Germany to such an extent that, on the most sober estimate, it seems improbable that she will be able to threaten Russia with defeat. A German military victory now passes from the improbable to the impossible, and, with it, the third phase gives place to the fourth—the prospect of complete Allied military triumph.

It might appear, on superficial examination, that the governing classes of Britain no longer have the same need for national unity. Their principal dread, the victory of Nazi Germany, is past, and therefore the cement which temporarily bound them to their political allies on the Left becomes friable. Some shallow-minded elements in the political stratification of the British governing classes are conscious of this, and show signs of increasing truculence. This mood has been particularly marked in the House of Commons, where the mildest measures of social reform, like the Catering bill and the Beveridge Report, aroused an opposition in Tory ranks which would have

[1] Comment on this article appears in the editorial section.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

been inconceivable in the frightening months of 1940 and '41.

These recalcitrant diehards are, however, ahead of their time. The British traditionalists are still desperately in need of the active support of the organized Socialist movement of Great Britain, for the task which they now have to achieve is infinitely more delicate than the one which faced them when Germany was loaded with military menace. *What they now need is the coöperation of British labor in the murder of the infant European revolution.* That is why reaction in Britain must still wear the mask of progressivism without at any moment yielding a single bulwark of privilege. That is why the young Disraelian Tories, like Lord Hinchingbroke, Quentin Hogg and Hugh Molson, continue to mouth the phrases of reformism anent the social services of Britain while, at the same time, they become almost incoherent with rage if our policy toward Europe is questioned.

It is no victory for British Tories if the defeat of Hitler is purchased at the price of European revolution. That is what is behind the persistent attempts to woo Stalin into joining President Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill at their many conferences. There is a general belief that Stalin is slighted. Nothing could be further from the truth. Wall Street and the City of London are most anxious for the Soviet Union to give its benediction to their schemes for the future settlement of Europe. It would, indeed, be the supreme irony of history if the Soviet Union should attempt the consolidation of the Russian Revolution by such a bargain. The thought could never dawn in our minds if it were not for the queer people who now seem to find salvation in the sight of the hammer and sickle. In the meantime, Stalin is wooed but unwon, and to all overtures, so far, he has replied with the victories of the Red Army and a reiteration of his demand for the fulfilment of the promise of a second front.

In the meantime the good people of this country lull themselves into quietude by the pledges of Roosevelt and Churchill that democratic constitutions will be encouraged in Europe in the wake of our armies. It would be a criminal mistake on our part to take these statements at their face value. They don't mean the same thing by democracy that we do. In the Europe of tomorrow the setting up of independent democratic governments will be charged with revolutionary implications. In many countries on the Continent political thinking has gone far beyond the mere establishment of forms of democratic practice such as we have in America and in Great Britain. Italian Socialists have already stated that Italian democracy would be fatally unstable if the powerful industrialists remain and the great landlords are still allowed possession of their estates. Does anyone in his senses imagine for a moment that British Tories and American big-business men are prepared to connive at democracy's doing on the Continent what they fight to prevent its doing here and in America?

But democracy and the possession of full liberty in the Fascist-ridden countries of Europe have come to mean something entirely different from the mere establishment of representative institutions and the secret ballot. These existed before the Nazi conquest, and millions of Europeans who still believe in them are also convinced that they cannot be safely sustained on the basis of the private ownership and exploitation of the economic life of the nation. If they try to translate that conviction into appropriate action when their chance comes, will they find benevolent support in the American State Department and in the British Foreign Office? Let AMG and the administration of North Africa give the answer. Will a British capitalist behave like a Tory in Britain and like a Socialist in Europe? The ruling class of Britain knows full well that it was easier to stop German tanks from crossing the English Channel in 1940 than it will be to stop revolutionary ideas from crossing in 19xx.

It is this specter which haunts the citadels of power today, as it haunted them in 1789, as it haunted them in 1848, and as it terrified them in 1917. It is this fear which makes the Tory Party anxious to preserve the façade of national unity, and it is this very fear which once more restores the political initiative to the forces of the Left in British politics if they will but seize it.

It has always been the tradition of socialism to reach under and behind governments where these were hostile, and to establish its own contacts with those of like minds in other countries. It was this attitude on the part of British labor which saved the Russian Revolution when world reaction tried to crush it by means of interventionist armies. Therefore, a special responsibility rests upon the leaders of labor at this moment, for have they not ceaselessly called on the workers of Europe to rise against their masters, night after night, in the foreign broadcasts, which were heard furtively in thousands of darkened homes by listeners who did so in peril of their lives? Now that the workers of Europe are rising, whose voice is it they hear speaking from the lands of liberation as Allied bombs rain on their cities? The same voices that cursed the Revolution, sympathized with the attack of Japan on China, praised Mussolini, flirted with Hitler, chanted the death of the League of Nations, cheered Franco on to the slaughter of the Spanish Republic and proved their black consistency by the appointment of Darlan.

Who speaks for labor and for all the decent progressives in this country? On the table as we write is the Labor Press Service and International Supplement. The only reference to the revolutionary situation in Italy is an article entitled "Noughts and Crosses." It is a tepid splutter of flatulent jingoism. It might just as

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

well have been written from the Tory Central Office as from Transport House. The title is well chosen. Noughts to describe the international policy of labor in this hour, and crucifixion for the brave Italian Socialists.

What is the line that labor should take in these circumstances? British democracy cannot assist in the establishment of democracy in Europe if it remains chained to the Coalition. The first step is not to leave the government. That may come, and probably will come, as the international crisis deepens. The first step is for labor to make its own independent pronouncements on the future of Europe, *and to bring them before the people by means of a sustained campaign.* This is necessary as much for the igniting of public opinion in this country as it is for the waiting masses of Europe. It has now become of first importance to make the people realize that there is an alternative to the policies being pursued by the American State Department and the British Foreign Office. It was the existence of an alternative policy and an alternative government which united and heartened the nation in 1940. It is the absence of this which debilitates us now.

The people have no measure by which to test the policies we are following in the international field. The supreme need is to supply them with it. There is no other way to make the government subject to the will of the people. *The time has come for labor to act, or brand itself as an accomplice in aborting the European revolution.* THE TRIBUNE (London)

The Literary Business in 1943

IF YOU WANDER into a publisher's office these days, you are likely to find him reading his sales reports with a bemused and beaming look that he never had before. Publishers are professionally a rather dour race, like saloonkeepers, and the reason is the same in both cases. The saloonkeeper is afraid to look happy because one of the barflies might strike him for a loan. It used to be that the publisher was afraid to look happy because his next visitor might be an author trying to get a larger advance against unearned royalties. But in 1943, for the first time that anyone can remember, he doesn't bother to act the part of a man stomach-ulcerated with financial cares. If he wants to publish a manuscript, the author can have his advance, cash on delivery of the outline and the first finished chapter.

In 1943 the public is buying books—not all books, and not always the books that critics think it ought to be reading, but at least those that answer its questions or manage to get themselves talked about. For a book to appear on the best-seller lists today means about three times as much in point of sales as it did ten years ago, during the depression, and about twice as much as it did in the Coolidge era. It means, to quote figures, that the ninth novel on the list compiled by Publishers' Weekly—it was "King's Row," by Henry Bellaman—had a bookstore sale of 85,000 copies in 1942. "Victory Through Air Power" was fifth on the non-fiction list and had a bookstore sale of 63,000, not counting the additional copies sold by the book clubs. On the other hand, scholarly or experimental works of the type that used to sell 1,200 copies—a pretty common figure—have lately been selling only 1,000 or 800. Next year such books may not be published at all, even if their literary value is beyond question. Most publishers think that this is a time to give the public what it wants, and it doesn't want difficult poetry or scholarly essays.

What it does want, in wartime, is not too hard to discover. It wants handbooks on subjects like welding, steamfitting, mathematics and military science in all its branches. "The Aircraft Spotter's Handbook" was published in June and advertised by mail; orders came in for a million copies. The Doubleday, Doran chain of bookshops reports that the sale of technical books as a class increased by 150 percent in 1942, though lately it shows signs of tapering off. The public also wants children's books, for which the demand has been steadily increasing—like the demand for toys, and probably for the same reasons. It wants first-hand accounts of the war, even when they are shoddily written (and lately some of them have come as close to pure illiteracy as anything since "The Young Visiters"). It wants humorous books like "See Here, Private Hargrove," which had a bookstore sale of 330,000 copies in 1942. Afterwards it was reissued by Pocket Books in a 25-cent edition that sold a million copies during the first month.

To continue the list, the public wants dictionaries and Bibles—so many of both that booksellers have had to be rationed. It wants novels with religious themes: for example, "The Keys of the Kingdom," "The Song of Bernadette" and "The Robe," which were, respectively, the best selling novels of 1941, 1942 and 1943. Apparently there is less demand for general fiction than there was before the war, but it is hard to say whether this is because the public taste is changing or because there have been very few interesting novels. Meanwhile the booksellers report a revival of interest in the ancient and modern classics. "War and Peace," in two editions, came close to outselling "The Moon Is Down." The Modern Library says that Plato's "Republic," "The Divine Comedy" and "Crime and Punishment" are three of its most popular titles.

The sales of the Modern Library since the early

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1920's have been a good index to the subjects that interest most readers. At first its most successful reprints were translations from the French, especially if they had a reputation for being naughty: two examples were "The Red Lily" and "Mlle. de Maupin." During the depression years, readers became more thoughtful; that was the time when both Freud and Marx were best sellers, not to mention John Strachey's "Coming Struggle for Power." Today the most popular fiction in the Modern Library is classical Russian or contemporary American. In non-fiction, Machiavelli is outselling Marx. There is a growing demand for standard poetry and philosophy and for books of the sort that people always say they would take along to a desert island, including Shakespeare and the Bible; the Modern Library is reprinting both of these. Its general sales have tripled in the last five years. Among the few titles no longer in demand are "The Coming Struggle for Power" and "Mlle. de Maupin."

Sometimes, however, you wonder whether people are actually reading more books in wartime. Althea Warren, the new president of the American Library Association, says that reading-room attendance in the public libraries has fallen off by nearly 50 percent. She thinks the decline is caused by the fact that 10,000,000 Americans are serving in the armed forces, while civilians are kept busy by home-front activities. These same conditions must have affected the rental libraries operated by bookshops and drugstores; many of these reported a loss in patronage during 1942. But although people are borrowing fewer books—except from their friends—they are certainly buying more of them. After writing to bookstores in all parts of the country, Publishers' Weekly estimated last January that the sale of new books had increased by 20 percent. The Retail Bookseller made a similar inquiry in June, and this time the average percentage of increase reported by the bookstores was slightly over 40.

All the publishers who issue cheap reprints are flourishing. Most of them report that they are getting orders for twice as many books in 1943 as they did in 1942; the only trouble is that they haven't copies enough to fill the orders. Many of them are refusing to open new accounts, and some—including Pocket Books and Grosset and Dunlap—have been forced to put their present customers on a quota system of purchases. The book clubs are larger than ever before. The Book-of-the-Month Club now has 590,000 members, as many as it can handle with its present equipment. The minimum sale for one of its monthly selections is about 250,000 copies, or five times as many as its average sale ten years ago. The maximum, so far, has been 396,000, for "The Moon Is Down." The Literary Guild, always its chief rival, has more than doubled its membership since 1938. Many of its monthly selections now sell more than 150,000 copies, not counting the additional sales in the bookstores.

Everywhere in the publishing world, the principal limitation is not lack of demand but lack of paper, lack of binding cloth, lack of printing facilities and sometimes lack of marketable manuscripts. The paper allotment has been cut to 90 percent of what each publisher used in 1942, and further reductions are expected this fall. The result is that lighter-weight paper is being used, with narrower margins around the type; many of the new books are only half as thick as they would have been a year ago. That doesn't solve the paper problem if they sell three times as many copies.

Books are also shorter, on the average. When an author comes staggering into a publisher's office with the typescript of a thousand-page historical novel, the publisher no longer grins in expectation of having another "Gone with the Wind"; instead he thinks of his paper stock and groans. After reading the manuscript, he usually tells the author how to chop it down to a size that can be economically handled. This is editorial tyranny, but so far it has aroused no revolt among book reviewers. As for the public, it goes on buying anything it wants to read.

The chief reason for the increased sale of books is apparently the same as for the increased sale of other merchandise: people have more money to spend and fewer items on which to spend it. In spite of rationed paper, books in wartime are much more plentiful than radios or silk stockings. The result is that merchants use them to fill their otherwise empty shelves; and customers buy them with some of the money that used to go for instalment payments on the new eight-cylinder sedan. Formerly it was the automobile that kept people from owning more books, for, in addition to consuming their money, it also burned up their leisure time. Today, as a result of rationed driving, more American families are staying home in the evenings to read or listen to the radio. When they travel, it is usually by railroad instead of highway, and they buy reading matter before they start.

These are temporary factors affecting the publishing business, but there are others that promise to be permanent. Books in general cost less than they did in the 1930's. They are being published in cheaper editions for a wider market; and even novels at the old price of $2.50 are relatively cheaper, considering that other prices have risen. They are now sold through many more outlets. Thousands of retailers—including Woolworth's—have added bookshelves or racks or counters, and there will be other thousands after the war. The book clubs have developed a vast audience, partly by personal solicitation. Finally there is the new public consisting of all the millions who have been graduated from high schools and colleges since 1920; for the first time, they are acquiring the habit of buying books.

One feature of the years between the two wars was the growth of higher education: American colleges had

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

767,000 students in 1926 and 1,316,000 in 1940. There was no such growth in the market for books, but the chief reason seems to have been that most college graduates didn't feel that they could afford them. For, when our new army was raised, beginning in 1940, it proved to have a greater appetite for all kinds of reading matter, from the comic strips up to Plato, than any other army in American history. And it was the same with the civilian public, after the industrial boom got under way in 1941: it wanted books when it had the money to buy them. The result has been that publishing and bookselling, which formerly depended on the carriage trade, are becoming an industry that appeals to the mass market. It is a development that will end by affecting American literature and American civilization as a whole. MALCOLM COWLEY

This is the first of two articles on publishing in wartime. The second will be called, "Books by the Millions." – THE EDITORS

National Service Is Here

IT IS WIDELY FELT in Washington that the new West Coast War Manpower Program which went into effect September 15 represents the last stage before a national service act. This latest plan for overcoming manpower shortages embodies the most constructive measures yet taken by Paul McNutt and the War Manpower Commission. It is a step in the direction of balancing production demand and manpower supply. It gives the government almost complete control over production and hiring practices in both war and civilian industries. All hiring in the five areas covered, San Diego, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Portland and Seattle, must be through the United States Employment Service, or approved through WMC channels. Workers will be assigned to employers on a system of manpower priority ratings. Industries will be allowed to employ new workers on the basis of present utilization records. Workers will be shifted from one job to another to maintain their greatest usefulness. There will be careful consideration before any additional war production contracts are allocated in the West Coast area, and as Mobilization Director Byrnes said in announcing the program, certain war contracts will be canceled and placed in other areas if labor shortages still exist.

On paper the West Coast program looks like the most drastic type of labor control possible outside a civilian labor draft, but its test, like that of all previous "plans," will be in its administration. As yet, there is almost no sign that there will be any new approach to the operational side of manpower mobilization. But it is still too early for any accurate reports on what is actually happening in the five West Coast areas where the program is in effect. And there is every reason to give this latest and best manpower program a chance to work before discarding it as a failure.

In testimony before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs the first day after Congress reconvened, Undersecretary of War Robert Patterson took advantage of the Senate's deep concern with the drafting of fathers to sound off on his favorite theme. The present manpower situation, he said, makes it necessary to enact legislation to create a selective civilian war-service system immediately—there is no other way to see to it that everyone of working age is doing his share of war work. "Voluntary methods for directing workers to war industry have been tried but have not filled the need."

Many competent officials who heard or read Undersecretary Patterson's testimony did not agree that all voluntary methods have been tried. Among them was Bernard Baruch, Byrnes's chief adviser. Some weeks ago, when the decline in aircraft production became alarming, General H. H. Arnold, chief of the Army Air Corps, went to Byrnes with his worries that this production lag would get in the way of the plans for attack in Europe and in the Pacific. Byrnes, therefore, asked Baruch and another of his assistants, John M. Hancock, the banker, to look into the whole manpower problem, particularly in aircraft, and recommend what should be done. Baruch and Hancock brought back a report which covered many of the important points, slighted some and completely disregarded a few major issues, but in general contained sound and constructive recommendations. Most of them are embodied in the new West Coast program which the Baruch report said must stand or fall on its administration. If we cannot administer this plan effectively, then neither can we expect to administer a national service act effectively.

Here is how it is expected to work out:

Two committees, composed of representatives of all government agencies concerned with manpower in the area, will deal with the production and the hiring practices of the employers in the region. Each of the committees will have chairmen selected from among the private citizens of the communities involved. One of the committees, to be known as the Area Production Urgency Committee, will survey the production schedules of all local plants and adjust them to conform to the available labor supply. The other, to be known as the Manpower Priorities Committee, will assign manpower priority ratings to the various plants in order of the urgency of their needs for workers.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The responsibilities of the local committees do not end with classification of the plants. The committees must cope with absenteeism, turnover and other troubles. The manpower-utilization program will be expanded to improve training and supervision, to reduce labor hoarding and to comb out underutilized labor. Under the new plan, the problem of community facilities in relation to turnover and absenteeism is given its proper importance. Now it will be the manpower-utilization consultants' responsibility to find out where shortages of housing, recreation, laundries, restaurants or medical-care facilities are cutting production and see to it that the President's Committee for Congested Production Areas gets action on these needed fronts.

Neither labor nor management is cheering for the new program. Neither group knows very much about it yet, but they both wryly note its resemblance to the highly publicized Buffalo Plan, which members of both groups strongly disliked. The two new committees on Production Urgency and Manpower Priorities supersede the hard-fought-for labor-management committees. This is enough to create labor distrust. Nowhere in the Baruch report or in the West Coast program is there so much as a passing reference to wages. Labor suspects that this plan, like all its predecessors, will be allowed to fail for lack of good administration and that its failure will then be used as the final argument for national-service legislation. And if a national service act is passed now, this suspicion will breed demoralization and ensure interpretation of the act as deliberate provocation of labor.

The Baruch manpower recommendations provide plenty of work for administrators to concentrate on now. The outstanding ones are: Make all deferments on the basis of occupation, fathers included, of course. Modify the Tydings amendment, which is largely responsible for our greatest manpower waste—agriculture—where nearly 1,500,000 workers out of a total labor force of 12,5000,000 have been deferred under the amendment, as compared with 1,400,000 industrial workers out of a 42,000,000 labor force during the same period. Reëxamine the civilian-supply program for possible cuts to save labor. Provide community and sanitary facilities as priority items. Release key aircraft and shipyard workers from the armed forces, in line with the recent release of 4,550 non-ferrous miners. Let no more contracts to crowded West Coast areas, cancel some existing ones and stretch out others. Use more women and children on part-time four-hour shifts.

The manpower situation is still acute in steel, aircraft, textiles and mining, among other industries. Unless occupation is promptly made the sole basis for deferment, the situation will rapidly grow worse as key industrial workers are drafted to fill quotas. The only cure for this critical problem is the same unromantic one that has been repeatedly urged by the Tolan and Kilgore Committees and publications like The New Republic—over-all production planning and balancing of manpower resources and production schedules. There is no short cut. Certainly legislation alone will not work the cure.

Washington HELEN FULLER

Salute to Bob Lovett

ROBERT MORSS LOVETT was born in Boston on December 25, 1870. By the calendar he is now past seventy, but most men in their fifties might envy his vigor and vitality of mind and body. Whatever role he may elect to play next, it will certainly not be that of the "slipper'd pantaloon" inactive on his shelf. For him inactivity would be the end.

He is of Puritan stock, and has a brother who is chaplain at Yale University. He himself may be described as a Puritan with a humanist's creed. He says of a sympathetic character in one of his novels:

> Miriam Gresham was a soldier too, but of a different type. She belonged by nature to the irregulars. Her conscience . . . was a partisan, waging warfare by all sorts of eccentric methods in behalf of doubtful causes. She had been an abolitionist. When a young woman, her ardent wish had been to shoulder a musket in John Brown's raid—and to suffer with its leader. She was a prohibitionist; a female suffragist; so far as she understood the matter, a socialist. Her mind was a vast teeming cave of Adullam; if you had explored it, you would have found there figures of the outraged and oppressed of all the world—the Chinaman compelled by England to buy opium, the Hindu widow fleeing from the suttee, the Siberian exile, the Chicago anarchist, the Negro, the Indian, the Mormon. Yet sentimentalist and fanatic as she was, she was never noisy, never insistent or argumentative. She lived at peace with her husband, with her sister-in-law, and outwardly, at least, with all men and women. In quietness she possessed her strength.

And later in the book her quality is called "moral knight-errantry."

Of course, Lovett is by no means drawing in "Aunt Miriam" an exact portrait of himself. Many of her most passionately cherished causes have not been his. He was born too late to be an abolitionist; he found prohibition triumphant an "experiment" anything but "noble"; and he was too aware of the jugglery in the term "socialism" to be drawn by any one propaganda for it.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Indeed, he paints "Aunt Miriam" as a good deal of a doctrinaire, a militant and confirmed joiner, a seeker after ideological Utopias. He is none of these things. If he has lent his name to some so-called radical associations, it has not been as a proselyte, but in response to a cry of human need or aspiration. He has never admitted acceptance of any theoretic system of society, though he has been interested in many. Keeping his own feet on the ground, he has fought concrete and personal injustice—or what he felt to be such—wherever he found it, and fought by the side of any individual or group that he believed to be like-minded with himself. He has generally enrolled himself in the Opposition, whatever party might be in power, being convinced that in human affairs dominance unchallenged is apt to mean domineering. Still, though not exact, his "Aunt Miriam" offers illuminating traits of her creator. He too has been a "moral knight-errant"—also no doubt with a reminder at times of that other of La Mancha, tilting in high resolve at windmills. His mind too has been an Adullam cave of the outraged and oppressed of the world. He too has been "never noisy, never insistent or argumentative"; above all, "in quietness he has possessed his strength."

Also reflected in her is another dominant trait of his—a deep and abiding sense of humor. He tells of her:

> In outward conformity she paid all due respect to the Congregational clergyman, the Rev. Mr. Worthy; but Mr. Worthy had once refused to extend the right hand of Christian fellowship to Jim Dutch, the Negro pastor. The first words of Miriam Gresham's will declared that her body was to be buried with the ministrations of "the Reverend James Dutch, if he be living and able to officiate." With this stone in her sling, she contemplated with considerable secret animation the probability that she would die before the Reverend Mr. Worthy should be called to another sphere of usefulness, either in this world or the other.

This was a stroke of vengeance after Lovett's own heart.

The same innate sense of humor would seem to explain his forming as an undergraduate a club, the members of which were to call themselves the "Laodiceans," or the Lukewarm. Lukewarmness being the very antithesis of Lovett's character, apparently the gesture was one of self-irony. With ironical humor he has taken most of his reverses of fortune—his unlucky financial ventures which painfully reduced the family resources, his being forced by economic reasons to give up "creative" writing, the not infrequent attacks made upon him by interests he had opposed, and even the culminating blow inflicted by Congress. Or perhaps humor is not the right word. It is rather an unconquerable serenity of spirit expressing itself humorously.

He writes of this latest blow: "Congress has made the mistake of putting my name into the appropriation bill, which makes it a bill of attainder, forbidden by the Constitution. Of course it was by attainder that Parliament cut off the Earl of Strafford's head."

And Lovett adds pleasantly: "Our advance in civilization is shown by the fact that it is only my salary that they have cut off." "Aunt Miriam" would have approved this riposte.

Also pleasantly tempering his crusader's zeal is Lovett's genius for friendship. He is quite too friendly a person to acquire the sour or condescendingly superior habit of some Boston-born reformers. Whenever a human wrong is not involved, he opposes smilingly; *castigat ridendo*.

Friendship is for him never a merely emotional experience. It means also giving to friends or working for them. One striking instance of many is when for several years he gave up his time and energies to rescuing a colleague in danger of ruining a brilliant career by drink; and he succeeded—though at the price of misunderstanding, and of his own neglected interests.

Because of his tolerant sympathies, Lovett's friends have been of oddly varied kinds—down-and-outers, labor leaders, notabilities, business magnates, society women. It makes no difference to him who or what you are, if he likes you, or you win his sympathy. Of all Lovett's friendships the most spontaneous are with children. He understands them; and they get on easily with him. After all, there is still a dash of the childlike in his own nature. His own children he kept enthralled through years by a continued epic tale, sustained with Ariostean ingenuity, upon the remarkable exploits of a certain little dog Fido. And children love to have him recite poetry to them, which, thanks to a remarkable verbal memory, he can do for hours on end. Also, he can, on occasion, play the admirable clown.

His special pride and affection was for his only son Robert junior, familiarly known as "Bimbles." Young Lovett was a quiet, rather shy lad, altogether unself-assertive, but as events were to prove, with plenty of grit under the surface. In his later teens he had acquired, at first only from reading exciting accounts of famous ascents, a passion for mountain-climbing. His father, who had carefully watched the boy's development, conceived it wise to encourage this interest, and characteristically Lovett himself took the lead. He had, as it proved, every requirement, except experience, for this sport of sports. He was full of daring expedients. Once on a family mountain-hike, a small donkey, supposed to carry one of the youngsters if tired, balked at crossing a brook. Nothing would move him—until at last Lovett charged him, full tilt, from behind. The donkey landed safely on the other bank. Lovett did not. But he would have done the same thing, probably, had the brook been a crevasse. He loves stiff tramping, and is singularly immune to the ordinary weaknesses of the flesh. He still never wears an overcoat,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

except perhaps when it rains—to avoid the greater injury of an umbrella. He is unacquainted with rubbers. Climbing the High Alps, he tired his professional guides; and his steady nerves made him as indifferent as they to perilous heights and depths. His example braced his willing but less hardy son; and together they climbed many of the famous peaks of the Tyrolean and Swiss Alps.

Naturally, all this adventurous companionship had brought father and son still closer together; yet when the United States entered the First World War in 1917, Lovett not only encouraged his son to volunteer, but also backed him in his refusal of a "safe" post as interpreter, obtained for him by influential friends because of his command of languages. Young Lovett was accordingly assigned to a fighting regiment as second lieutenant. Some months later in Belleau Wood he unflinchingly carried out orders which he knew were sending him and the small detachment he led to virtually certain, and certainly futile, death. As was admitted afterwards, somebody had blundered. His son's death, and more especially the stupid needlessness of it, was the hardest blow Lovett ever received, or was to receive; but as all who know him can testify, it in no degree dimmed his proud loyalty. One wonders how many of his congressional detractors can show a like patriotic fortitude.

Next to righting of wrong and cherishing of friends, Lovett's deepest interests have been writing and teaching. From the beginning he aspired to imaginative writing, contributing short stories to that most high-toned of college periodicals, The Harvard Monthly, of which he was also editor. Afterwards he published two novels—"Richard Gresham" (1904) and "A Winged Victory" (1907)—and a play, "Cowards" (produced in 1904, and published in Drama, 1917). In later life he turned rather to critical and editorial work. He became editor of The Dial in 1919, and served on the editorial board of The New Republic, 1921-40, a connection which played so large a role in his subsequent life. In these journals he produced many workmanlike reviews and vigorous articles. Also, independently or in collaboration, he published a number of literary-historical and educational studies. A side-activity in the literary field was his service for a number of years as a member of the jury for the Pulitzer Prize Novel.

Doubtless the main reason why he gave up imaginative writing was that he could not afford the luxury. His novels have high quality, but did not attract a wide enough public to be lucrative. He had a growing family to support, and the insistent appeals to be met of his many underdogs and hungry causes. He has spent little on himself. In one thing he is conservative, maintaining the *status quo ante*. He invariably wears a double-breasted sack-coat, a trifle short and a trifle tight around his ample girth. The economic advantage lies in the difficulty of telling whether it is the same or another.

In 1893, Dr. Harper, president of the new University of Chicago, invited to form a department of English a group of young Harvard men, including John Manly, William Vaughn Moody, Robert Herrick and Robert Lovett. Manly was the scholar of the group; the others were rather productive men-of-letters. Lovett was also that, but he was even more drawn to the human side of teaching. In consequence, though never, until 1936, giving up the duties of a professor of English, he also from 1903 to 1920 functioned as a dean. In both capacities he has come into close contact with hundreds of young people, and has won from them a devotion and gratitude comparable to that accorded to Dean Briggs of Harvard. Also, not a few noted American novelists of today are alumni of his instruction in the art of fiction.

In connection with his university career it is worth noting that when about a decade ago certain powerful business interests attacked what they called Lovett's radicalism, and sought to have him removed from his university position, he was publicly and cordially supported by the president of that institution. Anyone familiar with academic matters will agree that no such official stand would have been taken except for good and sufficient reasons. College presidents—even the best—are likely to be not insensitive to the demands of potential patrons—or potent foes.

It seemed, when in 1939 Lovett was appointed Government Secretary of the Virgin Islands, that his merits as a citizen had at last become publicly recognized. That recognition was the main appeal of the position, since the salary was relatively insignificant. It is fortunate that, although sixty-nine years of age, Lovett had retained so much vigor of mind and body, since the post proved to be a hard one—not so much in itself, as because an habitually absentee Governor forced him to meet, with only the rank and title of a subordinate, the responsibilities of his official superior, especially as that superior was from the start personally hostile. How well, nevertheless, Lovett met these responsibilities, how thoroughly he won the respect and admiration of the islanders, is attested by the unanimity with which their representatives have rallied to his defense.

And now, thanks to the instigations of the Governor, the cumulative but uncritical and unscrutinized charges of the Dies Committee and the questionably constitutional action of a politically minded Congress, Lovett has been practically driven from office. It is not the purpose of this sketch to attempt any juridical defense of him. It may be remarked that again his President—this time the President of the United States—has risen to his defense, and publicly and cordially supported him. Suffice to say in addition that before any fair and informed tribunal his character and career would need no defense. That he has been "liquidated" without a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hearing is not the American way, but the Hitler way.

Lovett's personal misfortune is to have been ahead of his time in his ideas of social justice. Great strides have been taken toward higher social justice during the last generation, both in this country and in England; but England is far ahead. And the advance is being accelerated by war conditions. In his novel, "Richard Gresham," of 1904, Lovett wrote—more than a decade before the establishment of the USSR:

> Bazoff saw in the vast, fertile prairies, directly in the path of the expanding Slavic people, the home of a new civilization; the opportunity one of the last which the world offered—of building a nation to embody a new social theory. And with all his Anglo-Saxon's prejudice in favor of individualism, Dick found in the social gospel of the Russian a hope, a dream, which tempted him more and more.

Have we not in this singularly prescient passage sufficient evidence—from the Dies point of view—of a "fellow traveler" to be? And yet more enthusiastic praises of Communist Russia appear daily, unchallenged, in our newspapers and periodicals. And why? Not because we are Communists, but because we realize that by their patriotic courage and efficiency the Russians are saving our skins.

In conclusion, one can only say that if this eviction proves to be the inglorious close of Lovett's public career, it is one more example of the ingratitude of republics.

JEFFERSON B. FLETCHER

Soldiers' Prose[1]

Soldier Thinking

THE PRESS gleefully reports a surge of anti-labor sentiment among our troops overseas. This points the interesting paradox that although we in the army are being very seriously prepared to fight our country's battles, this might almost as well be an anti-Martian as an anti-Fascist war for all the effect our mission has had on our training and our faith.

It is well to note some of the healthy political effects which our people's army has had on those who serve in it. For one thing, a great many men are enjoying decent living standards for the first time. They will not return to poverty complacently. Then along with its new tendency toward "global thinking," America's sense of nationality is being deepened; regional differences and suspicions are being dissipated.[2] Perhaps the most important development is the growth of new attitudes of tolerance, of coöperation, of collective action and self-discipline, which the individual learns both in combat and on KP.

Yet our political opinions are still derived and nourished from the old civilian sources of myth and rationalization—the newspapers, magazines, movies and radio—all dedicated to the proposition that in our best of all possible social orders every man is as secure and happy as he might ever expect to be.

Mildness and indecisiveness characterize American thinking on almost any controversial public subject. We do not feel and live our politics intensely, as Europeans do. Nice people will keep conciliatingly silent if any queer, "ill mannered" person attempts to expound alien and indiscreet theses in loud and eager language. We react to the war pragmatically in terms of specific events, in terms of its material effects on us and our material part in it, rather than in terms of any motives or causes or purposes. We consider our enemies as aggregations of opposing arms and techniques rather than as opposing moral forces. The advertisements invariably invoke the image of battle as an aid to the sale of toothpaste, toilet paper or nail-polish remover, but the scenes they depict are mere mechanical acts of war without implicit reference to the social values of these acts.

The whole American morale situation is dominated by the "mechanic," as opposed to the "dynamic," approach. At the camp in which I took my basic training the administration wisely instituted a series of weekly 15-minute "orientation lectures"—news summaries mainly condensed from Time magazine. They were broadcast over the public-address system and attendance was compulsory for all personnel. The programs were followed by 15-minute discussion periods directed by company officers. This enforced subjection to "propaganda" aroused general annoyance and resentment. The discussion usually degenerated into speculation regarding some purely technical military device or gadget, like the new bazooka rocket gun or the RAF's block-buster bombs. At best it dealt with matters like the Nazi submarine war or the probable location for the Allied invasion of Europe. Whenever higher politics was mentioned, the prevailing opinion was generally confused or reactionary. For instance, my company commander's remark that "if our children don't have to lick Russia, then our children's children will," went unchallenged except in the thoughts of a few men (who did not openly contradict him because he was the company commander). When I once referred to Marshal Pétain as a "Hitler stooge," the following speaker indignantly asserted that Pétain was a fine old

[1] This is one of a series of articles and sketches submitted in our Soldiers' Prose competition. These are paid for at our regular rates and there is also a special prize for the best entry submitted during each calendar month.—THE EDITORS

[2] Unfortunately the new Yankee invasion has tended not to liberalize the South, but to spread Southern prejudices.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gentleman who was trying to help his suffering country as best he could, and the majority of the audience concurred in this judgment. Such controversy was infrequent, however, since it was considered foolish to get wrought up over something that "nobody knows anything about anyway."

We want to go home, almost all of us, only after the war is over and won, but our closest concern is with the personal security of "going home" rather than with the more important collective security of victory. Lack of this personal security makes for the soldier's griping and his martyr-like rage at "draft-dodgers" and "defense strikers." The tough part about soldiering is not the work or the hours (which are in general exceeded by those of the average war worker), nor is it the discipline; it is the lack of status (no one knows where he's going next) and the removal from sources of personal intimacy and allegiance—home, family, friends.

For optimum conditions of morale and adjustment, these emotional ties must be replaced by a new sense of purpose and responsibility. But can a man who thinks that he is in the army because Pearl Harbor was bombed or because Hitler violated a treaty, feel himself morally and emotionally involved in this war?

The ordinary American soldier does not hate his opponents, as, for example, the Russians and Chinese do. Such hatred is born only out of a keen sense of personal injury which Americans cannot feel. But a vicarious sense of injury can be engendered by the manipulation of symbols, and in this our propaganda, military and civilian alike, has failed. The pitch of dramatic participation comes through the use of *human* elements—passion, pathos, heroism—which arouse the wish to emulate or aid. Remember the great Loyalist posters with their fierce love for the Spanish people and their fierce anger at the people's foes!

Unquestionably our military leadership recognizes the importance of building in its soldier wards an awareness of the political nature of their status and their actions. It has instituted discussion programs like the one mentioned above, lectures on world history as a part of the basic-training curriculum, weekly news maps and an excellent series of films. The army orientation program is intelligently conducted, but it deals with static facts, not with the dramatic, controversial texture in which the facts appear.

Hatred of fascism depends on some degree of understanding of its nature and its works, and on recognition of the strong human values which fascism seeks to destroy. It presupposes a set of positive democratic incentives which can be as impelling a force for our morale as Hitler's Nazi ideology once was for the German army. Yet our war aims have not been given clear definition and our enmity is diffused and weakened against a variety of headings (Axis powers, aggressors, war lords, little yellow men). Our official morale-builders cannot explain fascism as an economic and social phenomenon, because that would involve too many sacred cows in our own national mythology, so they must treat it as a kind of political aberration rooted in the tribal instincts of the guilty nations.

Beyond private discussion there is little that the politically enlightened soldier can do to educate his comrades. The red label, once jokingly applied, is a real handicap and difficult to lose. It is now the duty of socially responsible civilians to act on behalf of those vigorous elements in the national population whose political energies are channelized into the crude process of killing Fascists.

When the war is over, America's demobilized soldiers will be a potential agency of reaction. Alienated personally from the material conditions of normal life, they will be subject to the influence of the old institutional symbols. Surely the forces of the Right are not leaving to post-war study the problem of organizing the future veterans. To many of these, joining the American Legion will sound the appeal of inclusion in the comfortable middle-class fraternity to which their parent generation belonged in desire if not in actuality.

To counter these menacing directives, there will be enormous need for an ex-serviceman's organization founded on the premise that men who are now in uniform serving the cause of democracy will continue to uphold and fight for democratic principles after the war is over. Its program should be broad enough to include adherents of the major political parties and of all anti-fascist views, and should be so clear-cut as to prevent subversion by reactionary interests.

The average soldier's strong sense of solidarity with his buddies will cause him to ignore or revise his not very intense political opinions in joining a veterans' league which already has a large membership and which is a going concern. A going concern requires cadre, funds and organization. Outside of big business, only one power in America can supply these needs and has a stake in meeting them: that is organized labor.

Let the executive bodies of the major unions appoint delegates to a temporary veterans' organizational committee. Let that committee draw up in simple outline the plans for a future veterans' association. Let the affiliated unions circularize their members or former members who are now in the armed forces, and obtain from them pledges of interest and support. From among these hundreds of thousands of contacts will develop a leadership which can assist in, and finally take over, the affairs of organization, as soon as demobilization starts. The new, progressively oriented league of veterans will thus begin active functioning almost immediately after victory, and will be able to attract to its ranks the millions of young men whose mutual problems in society will demand correction in a mutual and practical form. G. I.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Washington Notes

Idealism v. Reaction

THE EDITORIAL TENDENCY is to sneer at Henry Wallace as an impractical idealist. He is a queer duck who wants World War II to mean something. Another Wallace speech?—ho, ho, ho!

Meanwhile the Vice President is going right ahead. He is presenting his economic and social philosophy in a series of speeches. He will insert among them a Saturday Evening Post piece next month. In a curious way there is evidence that his talks are taking hold. Mr. Wallace himself believes that his popular influence has gone up as his political influence has gone down. Newspapers are getting into difficulties slurring over Wallace texts and taking out their spleen in editorial attacks next day. The trouble with this tried-and-true technique is that when some harpooned corporation like Standard Oil rushes out with a "must" rebuttal, it becomes rather confusing to present it without having printed the original reference. That happened to The New York Times last week.

What is Wallace after? He wants the liberal side to be presented and he is out to present it. It was a letter from the elder Josephus Daniels a year ago that started him thinking, and set him off. He wants the liberals to fight, and can see no reason why they shouldn't win. They are winning elections in Australia, and the Canadian provinces, and showing their power in Britain. Why should reaction necessarily sweep the United States? Young Americans are dying, too, in this war; aren't they dying for something great, and worthwhile? His body of philosophy is rounding out with his talks. He doesn't want international cartels to take over where the United Nations leave off. He believes American foreign policies are based on domestic conditions: a full-production economy at home is necessary for a liberal foreign policy abroad.

There is a political fissure between Roosevelt and Wallace. The Vice President does not regard it as a personal fissure. He believes, rightly or wrongly, that a Democratic victory is essential for the liberal cause next year. There is a curious parallel between Wallace and Welles. Both of them apparently remain loyal to Roosevelt although each of them was thrown out as a sop to conservatives—Jesse Jones and Cordell Hull, respectively.

What is the answer to the mystery? Here is one that at least sounds plausible. Mr. Roosevelt is determined to keep a sympathetic Senate. Woodrow Wilson lost out because he had a hostile Senate. The Constitution requires a two-thirds Senate majority to ratify a peace treaty. It's not Mr. Roosevelt's fault, is it, that the Founding Fathers set up the rules so that it is relatively easy to declare a war, with merely a majority vote of both houses; but that it is frightfully hard to ratify a peace treaty, with a two-thirds vote required of only one house? The effect of that was to give every hostile Senator (every Wheeler and Brooks) two votes, while leaving every better-worlder with only one.

If this interpretation is right, Mr. Wallace may not be the vice-presidential candidate next year. But he will go right on making speeches. And his personal relations with the President may not be severed. There is more than an indication that his views are still largely the same as the President's even now, as they were when Mr. Roosevelt forced a hostile convention to accept Wallace as candidate at Chicago in 1940.

Congress isn't thinking very much about peace treaties right now. It has matters nearer at hand. Even for an old connoisseur of congressional mix-ups, the mess the boys have got into over the Smith-Connally anti-strike bill is something of a record. That the measure is a horrible example of haste and hate—perhaps the classic of World War II—is increasingly obvious. Every labor-baiter wanted it. Now it has boomeranged. Not only is it promoting strike votes all over the lot but it threatens to aid labor; in fact it has given labor a nasty new weapon. Business is really frightened. The question here is whether the thing is so bad that Congress will sink its pride and amend the act, or whether it is so *very* bad that Congress won't go near it with a 10-foot pole—as happened with the Volstead Act.

The intelligently edited McGraw-Hill publication, Business Week, of September 10, blurted out the awful truth: the law shouldn't be amended at all, it contends; it should be scrapped outright. It threatens untold harm in a delicate field of human relations, into which politicians should never have entered. That editorial fits in with what the biggest Detroit manufacturers were saying a year ago to a party of newspapermen. They just didn't want any labor law. They wanted Congress to lay off; they wanted to work out their own problems with the unions.

In every opportunity given workers to vote under the bill since it took effect about 12 weeks ago, they have voted to strike. That doesn't mean they want to strike, but the measure gives them a new method of bringing pressure on employers. It also gives opportunities for trouble-makers of all sorts. John L. Lewis, against whom the act was directed, has been its chief beneficiary. The "anti-political-contribution" feature, I am told, is easy to circumvent, and has goaded unions to a new political activity on a national scale that has got Congress scared. In all of 1942 the ratio of strike man-hours lost to hours worked was only .06 (not, as Time magazine recently said, six-tenths of one percent, but six-one-hundredths of one percent), which is almost infinitesimal. That was under the voluntary no-strike pledge. Now, despite the anti-strike law, the number of strikes is still gratifyingly low, but it has increased.

My impression is that the law is so bad that something has to be done. So far most of the cases have been petty. But a really big one is pending now in Michigan, where one labor faction is deliberately trying to use the act's machinery to force government seizure of a key plant, and others are in prospect. Some of the law's provisions are practically non-enforceable.

Incidental Note: When Business Week's editorial was brought to the attention of Howard K. Smith's office (Smith being author of the act) dark suspicions were engendered. No, Mr. Smith wasn't in. But was this magazine *really* representative of business? What was Business Week? I got the impression that McGraw-Hill would have a call from the Dies Committee in a few days.

Washington T. R. B.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Love in the Foxholes

"SO PROUDLY WE HAIL," a movie which shows what it is like to make love in the foxholes of Bataan, on the decks of troop transports and in the rocks of Corregidor, is so rotten and the two millions which Paramount spent on making it so obviously distributed in the right directions to get it all back in paid attendances, that the film's only importance is in indicating certain attitudes of the commercial mind. In war pictures the exhibitors ask, and presumably the audience, "Where is the love interest, leg art and comedy?" By deciding to make a war movie with women protagonists (nurses) Paramount found the answer, ably assisted by the snide movie attitude toward women. The lives of women in the movies are almost exclusively confined to love careers of a dreams-come-true nature. So that whereas audiences wouldn't stand for a movie which showed Bataan's soldiers spending half their time making love, they feel it is perfectly natural for movie women to do so, especially if the women are Claudette Colbert, Veronica Lake and Paulette Goddard. War or no war, then, the Misses Colbert, Lake and Goddard can devote their nursing life to the fulfilment of their love.

Given this premise, the theatre owners get this cheesecake in hunks so great that much of the movie hinges on Miss Goddard's black nightie; Miss Colbert's difficulties as commanding officer become exactly those of a headmistress in a school for young ladies; and the sex resides in Sonny Tufts's kiss, which Miss Goddard kicks back from as though he had a firecracker in his mouth.

This is the kind of movie that gives me the shakes. It is teeming with varieties of one woman, whose looks, personality and talent for acting are strikingly unsuited to passing instruments in a caesarian operation in the Marivales jungle, or for throwing herself on her stomach under ambulance cars to escape enemy bullets, or speaking of the way the Japanese treated women in Nanking. She has that hard, vacant map that Max Factor could produce on Orphan Annie, and which hides implacably anything out of the way or natural like a thick eyebrow or an underslung jaw, or skin that doesn't reflect the sun of Bataan like steel plate. Her acting is like Drama Day with the Camp Fire Girls—Now we are in an airplane, girls, now we are tired and distraught, etc. The material she is given to act is a stale romanticism of Dolly Dawn, and her pal, Dolly Dawn, who went on a cruise to Hawaii, and while one falls in love with the handsome doctor who teaches laboratory technique at the University of Hawaii the other, more playful, falls in love with the comical All-American football player named Kansas. This used to be barely acceptable as the plot to display the merits of Bing Crosby's singing, the Marx Brothers' comedy or Fred Astaire's dancing: here it is for serious—for describing Bataan. Accompanying it is a running commentary composed of solid cliché (". . . after a nerve-wracking trip through the jungle . . .") spoken off-screen by relays of nurses.

"So Proudly We Hail" is admirably filled with stuff to earn money, but even so the writer shouldn't have been allowed to get away with murder. He has built a whole movie on the fact that Lt. Janet "Davy" Davidson has been in a coma ever since she was told her lover was given up for lost on a raiding trip. At the beginning of the movie a psychiatrist walks in with a letter from said lover, takes one discouraged reading of Davy's pulse, and then informs the seven nurses of her unit that he may be able to bring Davy to if they tell him—the doctor—absolutely everything that happened on Bataan. So the nurses tell what being in love on Bataan was like ("after a nerve-wracking trip through the jungle") in an hour-long flashback, and at the end the doctor says he thinks he can bring her to. He then reads Lieutenant Davidson the letter and she wakes up. I contend a really good psychiatrist would have read Davidson that letter without a flashback.

There are three good things, which seems hardly a fair trade for two million dollars; but anyway, they are: a mother who says to her daughter's friend, "I like you; you eat so much"; a performance by Sonny Tufts, who has been coached too well to use his hands like Cary Grant but gets his pantomime over with a rather tricky sense of timing; and a meaningful bit by a Filipino doctor (Ted Hecht) who ruminates aloud while he operates. MANNY FARBER

The Ham Hangs High

A New Life, by Elmer Rice. Royale Theatre, September 15, 1943.

IN THE HINDU SCRIPTURES there is a saying about the man who passes through life as a spoon through soup without perceiving the flavor.

The new Elmer Rice play, his twenty-fourth, presented by the Playwrights' Company, tells the story of Edith, a night-club glamor girl, and Bob, a very rich young man. Meeting, champagne, dancing, marriage on the impulse, two weeks of honeymoon, his call to the South Pacific, reports of his death, a baby about to be born and the young man's parents coming up in their private car for the event. He is not dead, however, but turns up suddenly in time for the baby's arrival. A struggle ensues between the young mother, who wishes to give her son what she thinks true values, and true life, and the grandparents, who wish, and are determined, to give the child the training and surroundings that will prepare him for the position he is born to. The struggle between the great-tycoon idea and the common-man idea almost parts the two young people; but a good, desperate all-night drunk, a long talk with a young radical and the promptings of his own real nature bring Bob back to Edith. They are to have twenty-four hours together before he goes back to the war, and thus the new life for the common man has won.

Thus we have a fair, stereotyped story that would never be satisfied without the addition of a social drama about the wicked rich, the common man and our common humanity, and the individual right to choose our living. None of it all matters very much, because nothing has actually been created. All is drawn black and white in every respect; and the progress of the event is oddly monotonous and stultifying.

What makes me think of the Hindu saying is the astonishment that comes over me every time I consider the material through which this dramatist passes and the complete imperviousness to the meaning and values involved, either as life or as art. This new play of Mr. Rice's turns up quite considerable matters, but except for a certain pro-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fessional security of technical hammering, it is mostly flat rubbish. To take one item: there is a scene where the baby is being born, so contrived that we see only the young woman with the light on her face, the rest is all voices. The scene lacks any genuine effect, is not very distressing or interesting or anything else save for being the unusual motif of a child being born on the stage. Even as it stands now, there could be but one reason or excuse for the scene, and that would be to show the terrific impact of life on this glamor girl by which she is helped toward the strength and resolution to fight for her child's rights, etc. There was no way to tell how much or how little of this the author meant the scene to express. It remains therefore merely flat and futile.

The divers roles are not written with enough insight or special development to make them effective in an actor's hands, but the performances in general were more than competent. Miss Field, in the leading part, was convincing, with moments of simple beauty. Mr. John Ireland's excellent playing of the disheveled radical friend was especially interesting as contrasted with his vigorous and stylish young Richmond last season in "Richard III." STARK YOUNG

The Bandwagon

Italy's future course, after surrender, is of no concern to the British and Americans, Mr. Bracken [British Minister of Information] said, in answer to a question as to whether Italy might do a turn-around and join the United Nations.—*From The New York Times.*

The saving of butter at the hospital was protested by State Treasurer Leslie M. Scott, who said he feared that the butter would be shipped to Russia. "I have been advised that the Russians are using our butter to grease their boots," Scott declared. —*From the (Salem) Oregon Statesman.*

Oops, Sorry!

CORRECTION—In Schuster's advertising for Saturday, we erroneously described the "RENUZIT" Cleaner (2 gallons for $1.29) as being "non-explosive." . . . We trust this error will cause you no inconvenience.—*From an advertisement in The Milwaukee Sentinel.*

On the Home Front

Mrs. James B. (Doris Duke) Cromwell, famed as the "world's richest woman," recently went to Nevada to establish residence, a possible divorce action being hinted as the reason. For this trip, Mrs. Cromwell was permitted to secure an entire box car, to ship three saddle horses, a shepherd dog, an automobile and a stableman.—*From The New York Times.*

That All-Out Effort

We still have in this country, particularly in the large metropolitan areas, at least 500,000 hoboes, bums, loafers, wife beaters, drunks, gambling joint patrons and dissipators of all kinds, who should be put in uniform at once.—*From The Milwaukee Journal.*

Total-War Department

August, 1943, finds us enmeshed in the bitterest struggle the world has ever known. Winning this war means endless sacrifices but they certainly will be worth while if ultimate victory will insure our democratic way of life. . . . We now find that for the duration the paper shortage will make it necessary for us to publish the Wallach Laundry News only once every two months instead of once every month as formerly.—*From a handbill of a New York City laundry.*

Our readers are invited to contribute to this column; $1 will be paid for each item used. Address Bandwagon, care of The New Republic. Please enclose the original clipping.—THE EDITORS

Correspondence

Gas Pains

SIR: I have long noted that it is characteristic of liberal journals to spare no pains in criticizing a person in public life who is regarded as a liberal. Your issue of September 13 proves no exception to this rule. However, it does seem to me that you went pretty far afield in your editorial under the caption "Motorists on Their Honor" to find something for which to criticize me. Apparently you do not believe, as you have pretended on many occasions, in the people being told the facts relating to public affairs. You would conceal unpleasant news until it burst with resounding force among the unaware. You chide me for making the statement that within a few days of the lifting of the pleasure ban some gasoline pumps in the East would go dry. You misstate the fact when you allege that I said "the gasoline pumps of the entire East were likely to go dry."

Where would we be today, so far as petroleum products are concerned, if I had not started out more than two years ago to say, over and over again, that we were heading into a scarcity of petroleum products because we did not have the transportation facilities to bring it East? Apparently this was wrong in your eyes. Recently I have been saying that coal will be scarce this coming winter. You have not rebuked me for this, but perhaps you haven't caught up with your reading. I assume that I am correct in concluding that the logic of your editorial will lead you to take me to task for forewarning people about the approaching scarcity of coal.

I don't so much mind your fly specks as I am distressed at your inconsistencies, because, after all, I am as old a reader of The New Republic as one could possibly be. But your appetite for criticizing liberals must be indulged in once in a while even if it puts you in the thoroughly impossible position of criticizing a public official for telling the people that gasoline pumps would go dry, as they would and did. And even if this word of caution did start a run on the gasoline stations, the motorists could not get gasoline, even if the tanks were full, could they, unless they turned in coupons which had been issued to them by their government?

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Washington, D. C. Secretary of the Interior

[Mr. Ickes who is, has been, and probably always will be one of our favorite characters in Washington, seems to be trying, by his barrage of letters to every newspaper and magazine

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which mentions his name, to frighten the editors into silence; and maybe he is succeeding. The New Republic doesn't single out either liberals or non-liberals for criticism; we comment on situations that seem to us to deserve it, regardless of the personalities involved. We don't object to telling the public the facts about gasoline, or anything else. What we object to is a multitude of confusing, sometimes contradictory and needlessly alarming statements in quick succession, no matter how many people they come from. If we misunderstood Mr. Ickes' latest statement, so did everybody else. There *was* a run on the gasoline pumps; and a lot of people filled up their tanks in panic, who didn't need to do so. It is a bad thing to issue coupons that the stations are unable to honor.

Mr. Ickes' last two paragraphs are just his fun. We can stand it if he can.—THE EDITORS]

The Jews and Palestine

SIR: In your issue of September 13 you write about "a sharp dispute [which] has broken out between two sections of the Jewish community in the United States," with reference to American Jewry's policy on Palestine as a Jewish state. In this "sharp dispute" you inform your readers that the American Council for Judaism opposes the formation of such a state while the American Jewish Conference favors it.

Your comment creates the unfortunate impression that each of these organizations represents a sizable section of American Jewry and is equally qualified to speak with some authority for it. What you neglect to mention is that the American Jewish Conference is a body specially convened this last month to formulate a united opinion of all American Jewry on war problems. The conference consisted of delegates elected by and from every Jewish community and organization in the United States. Of the 502 delegates thus elected all but 4 were in favor of a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine.

The American Council for Judaism, on the other hand, consists of a small minority of individual Jews, primarily in Philadelphia and Cincinnati. The fact that its viewpoint was upheld by less than one percent of a body representative of all American Jewry indicates quite sufficiently the importance to be attached to the council as a spokesman for American Jewry.

So instead of decrying the "unfortunate quarrel" and "sharp dispute," The New Republic would have been much closer to the truth if it had applauded the almost complete unanimity of American Jewry on this most crucial question. . . .

Chicago, Ill. DON PATINKIN

A Meeting South

SIR: After reading some of your comments on discrimination against Negroes, I thought you might be interested in my experience, which happened on the streets of this supposedly enlightened city [Miami], of which I have been a resident for eighteen years.

Walking leisurely one lunch hour from my bank to my office, I met an old Negro friend of mine, whom I had not seen for more than a year. Naturally, we stopped, shook hands and began conversing in the usual casual manner of all friends or acquaintances who have been separated for some time, when the gruff voice of the traffic officer screamed at me to step to the curb, which I did. He dismissed my Negro friend with "Beat it, Nigger," and turning to me, asked for all identification evidence down to the minutest detail, Selective Service registration card, membership cards in all civic organizations, driver's license, etc. Being a law-abiding citizen, I presumed that he was looking for a criminal, who might resemble me, and this did not infuriate me, but after examining all my credentials, he disgustedly handed them back to me, and for the first time I was informed of my "offense." With utter contempt, and facial expression to match, he warned me never to shake hands with a Negro on HIS street, and if I did, he threatened me with something or other, which I did not hear, being by that time so flabbergasted and upset as to be beyond even the sense of hearing. He also added that if I had no respect for myself, other members of the white race had, that I had defiled it in the most disgraceful manner.

As I did not care to argue with such an ignorant officer, I immediately dispatched a letter to the City Manager, which I carried to him personally, and he informed me that "proper steps would be taken to correct this." Knowing some of the past history of Miami, even this was quite a concession to a common taxpayer. . . . Yes, this happened, not in Germany, Poland, or some occupied country of Europe, but in the good old U. S. A.

Miami, Fla. H. H. NELSON

V-Letter from England

SIR: Article of War Sixty-two suggests that the good soldier not use "contemptuous or disrespectful words against . . . the Congress of the United States." After checking the record of the first session of the Seventy-eighth, some of us feel that obedience to this order is one of the many aspects of life in wartime that Congress has not made easy.

Somewhere in England CORPORAL

What Ferrero Believed

SIR: I was rather astonished to read in the article of Mr. Albert Guérard in The New Republic of September 6 that my father, Guglielmo Ferrero, advocated the monarchic regime in Italy as the only legitimate one. The whole of my father's life and struggle has been for a new, democratic, republican Italy.

Probably Mr. Guérard has not read my father's last three books, as in one of them, "The Gamble," my father showed how already in the nineteenth century the House of Savoy betrayed its subjects by opening wide the gate to the Napoleonic armies. In the second, "Reconstruction of Europe," he clearly stated: "There is only one political form which is possible today for a Western people, and that is a representative government, a government whose powers are all directly or indirectly delegated by the people, who are bound to obey them" (preface, p. 8).

In his last book, published posthumously here a year ago, "The Principles of Power," he clearly stated about the House of Savoy and the kingdom of Italy: "The kingdom of Italy from its foundation in 1861 to the fascist coup d'état in 1922, was also a quasi-legitimate government. . . . Though legitimate in the former kingdom of Sardinia, the House of Savoy did not carry on its legitimacy when it annexed the lands of the other Italian dynasties . . ." (pp. 217-8).

And there are thousands of other examples of my father's faith and struggle for democratic, representative institutions.

New York City NINA FERRERO RADITSA

SIR: I was glad to read the protest by Nina Ferrero Raditsa. Ferrero is worth having on our side. I was accusing—hypothetically—not Ferrero himself, but some of his disciples. He is not the only master whose thought has been distorted by his followers. But it must be confessed that he was partly responsible for the misapprehension. If he did not originate the rather absurd craze for Talleyrand and the treaties of Vienna, he lent it the support of his great authority. He made subtle—perhaps oversubtle—distinctions between legitimist governments which were revolutionary and revolutionary governments which were legi-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

timate. Cruder thinkers turned all that into a thoroughgoing apology for legitimacy in the most conservative sense. I agree that at present, the only legitimate government in Italy would be a revolutionary one.

New York City ALBERT GUÉRARD

The National War Fund

SIR: I should like to call to the attention of New Republic readers the National War Fund. This fund simplifies the work and strengthens the hands of a score of agencies we believe in and must support. It harnesses, controls and directs energy where it will do most good. Do what you can to raise the waterhead. It is going to take a lot of power to lighten the burden of the innocent.

Peace Dale, R. I. LEONARD BACON

An Indian to Upton Sinclair

SIR: Upton Sinclair in his letter, addressed to the Bombay Progressive Writers' Association and the Upton Sinclair Society, which appeared in The New Republic of August 30, warns the Indians that in seeking freedom now they would land from "the British frying pan into the Japanese fire"; that the only goal in the world worth aiming at now is the destruction of the Axis despotism; that the task of self-government in India will be enormously difficult due to the multiplicity of languages; "Why make the task any harder by trying while the Japanese barbarians are pounding at your gates?"

Mr. Sinclair evidently forgets that all that the Axis stands for is repugnant to the inner spirit of the Indians. Non-violent in the fight for their own freedom, they offered to take up arms against the Axis, but as free men and not vassals. The kind of freedom they asked for in the midst of war was the one that would have helped mobilize Indians' moral and material resources to combat the common foe. Britain has arrogantly spurned their overtures.

Yes, Mr. Sinclair, the paramount issue is the destruction of despotism. But what about the British despotism in India? That it is milder, more subtle despotism, than that of the Axis does not alter the fundamental moral issue.

You conjure up the perennial bogey of languages. Language is not the real difficulty in India's path to self-government. Almost one-half of India speaks Hindustani, and the dialects of the other half are less numerous than are those of Russia and China. In our view, the real difficulty is that Britain has no intention of relinquishing her hold on India now—or after the war. The difficulty is not that Indians speak so many languages, but that one language they have never learned—the language of bombs, stuka divers, tanks, fire and steel. There are ominous signs that the younger generation is becoming painfully aware of this.

New York City ANUP SINGH

Only Lawyers Need Apply

SIR: In some places in the United States, I understand, one has to be a member of the Ku Klux Klan to be considered a 100-per-cent American. In Onondaga County, New York, however, that rule is not applicable; here one has to be a lawyer, according to a decision by Justice Clifford H. Searl of the local Supreme Court.

I was nominated for District Attorney by the American Labor Party's county committee. The Farley-Democrat candidate served me with a summons to show cause why my name should not be omitted from the primary ballot because I am not a lawyer.

I found that under the Constitution of the United States I am qualified to become a candidate for President; that the New York State Constitution requires only one qualification of a candidate seeking office within the state: that the candidate be a citizen of New York State; that the District Attorney of Hamilton County, New York, is a non-lawyer; that Article IV, Section 2, of the Constitution of the United States reads: "The citizens of each state shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of the several states"; that Section 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution reads, in part, as follows: "No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States. . . ."

My name was not printed on the ballot at the primary election, so the ALP voters wrote my name in the blank space.

Walter Soule, the ALP attorney, would have appealed the decision of the court to the Appellate Division; yes, even to the Supreme Court of the United States if necessary, because some of us believe a very important democratic right is on trial in this case. But the stenographic work alone to make the initial appeal would cost $40; and the stenographic work for carrying the appeal to the highest tribunal would cost $1,000. And there are only $16 in the ALP treasury. We just can't afford the cash price to buy justice for all the non-lawyers who are citizens of the State of New York.

RONALD GRAHAM

Howlett Hill, N. Y.

From The New Republic Mail Bag

Harry N. Owen writes from Minneapolis to say that the reason the United States has no continuing foreign policy is because of the provision for having treaties ratified by a two-thirds vote of the Senate, plus the change of administration that may and sometimes does happen every four years.

Whidden Graham, of New York City, feels that the newspapers have acted badly in their demands for large amounts of newsprint in spite of the war. He finds in his daily paper many things which he feels might better have been omitted.

J. Anthony Marcus writes from Washington, D. C., to express approval of George Soule's article, "What to Do About Labor" [The New Republic, July 5]. Mr. Marcus wants Mr. Soule's ideas carried out, through the coöperation of government agencies, national labor unions and representatives of consumers. He says we should "hammer away until Mr. Soule's plan is translated into action."

Gaston J. Ley writes from Lafayette, California, a long letter with quotations from The United States News. Mr. Ley believes his quotations show that the magazine is unsympathetic to Russia. He thinks the editors of The United States News speak for those Americans who are afraid that the Russian armies may get to Berlin before we do.

Marjorie Craig, New York City, writes to call our attention to the biennial conference of the National Association for Nursery Education, which will meet in Boston, Massachusetts, October 22-25. The general theme this year is "the community serves the child in war and peace."

The Society for Ethical Culture of New York City announces that the third annual semester of John L. Elliott Institute of Human Relations will be held in October. The Institute has been established by the Society "for the purpose of broadening the opportunity for democratic consideration of critical human issues." Lectures will be given during the evening on political and other contemporary subjects, and also in the field of literature. Among the speakers are J. Raymond Walsh, Dr. Henry Neumann, Algernon V. Black and Jerome Nathanson. Further information may be obtained from the Society's headquarters at 2 West Sixty-fourth Street, New York City.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books in Review

What Is to Be Done

HERE IS a bold and candid book[1] on matters of great urgency and one that is at the same time wise and illuminating. *If* read widely enough and understood—widely and also in the right places—it could prove to be a major contribution to the war at a moment when there has dawned on the American people with brutal clarity the truth that the eminent authors of this book have phrased in these words, "Geographical, political and religious factors make of Italy a pivotal point in the history of Europe, and hence, to a certain extent, of the world."

The value of this book is that these two distinguished historians have taken soundings in the deeper currents of American policy with such skill that directions of flow and other data are as clear as if they were on a chart. If in trying to keep too close to the news and to anticipate it too much in detail, they have gone wrong as to some surface eddies, the essential validity of their work is in no way vitiated. They present their findings with imposing documentation and sobriety, in a style that is at once direct, zestful and urbane. The grimness of their recital is made bearable by a frequent waspish phrase. The only farcical relief is found in the pages dealing with the dither of English and American notables over the Caesarian apparition in its heroic days and those having to do with the *le roi fainéant*. By far the greater part of the book is devoted to an examination of Vatican policy in relation to the rise and world success of the totalitarian powers in general, to Italian fascism specifically, and to our own foreign policy.

In dealing with Vatican policy, a subject on which Americans have developed, and have been encouraged to develop, an almost Victorian reticence, the authors manage to be both candid and cool. Their documentation is impeccable. They state that they are aware of the storm their analysis will provoke. But in this reviewer's opinion, they could be accused of "anti-clericalism" only by those who resent all discussion, however friendly, of the essentials of Church policy and by those who deny or are unaware that anti-clericalism is nothing but the riposte to clericalism—a truth that is explained with final clarity by the authors themselves. And they could be accused of "intolerance" only by those—and there are many—who consider that the only justification of our deeply rooted tradition of religious tolerance is that it so often serves to shield intolerance.

Altogether, a perusal of this book offers a cleansing, humbling experience at a time when so many Americans are proposing to "educate" various peoples in Europe. First, because it shows our tremendous responsibility for the rise of fascism, and second, because it underlines so disturbingly the fact that American thinking on the cardinal developments of modern history is in large part grotesquely at variance with the facts. And one is forced to conclude that the thinking of far too many Americans high in policy-making spheres is still influenced by the legacy of ideas handed us by the Fascists and their associates—such a conception as that repeated the other day by Badoglio, that the Italian people *chose* fascism, their democracy having proved so futile and corrupt. This is what Don Luigi Sturzo would call a "current truth" forged by Fascist propaganda to supplant the "historic truth." More "current truths" are being forged at this hour, and one of them is that the disappearance of high-ranking *fascisti* cleanses any society of "fascism."

Professors Salvemini and La Piana have contributed some careful and constructive thinking on nearly all of the problems of the post-war, on the Lateran Treaty (which they think should be maintained *without* international guarantees), on frontiers, on land reform, on the treatment of the great industrial combines that grew up under fascism. These they think should be nationalized, but they foresee the outcry from this country. Their solutions are in large part of a deeply conservative, even cautious, nature. But they are forthright in their assertion that political democracy cannot exist apart from economic democracy and that "those who oppose economic democracy must renounce political democracy as well and choose between fascism and communism."

They are evidently anxious but not hysterical about the post-war role of the Communists. Nevertheless they do not give enough consideration to the potentialities of the role of the Soviet Union in the Mediterranean and in the Balkans, which bids fair to upset many a careful calculation.

With a book that is essentially so illuminating one hesitates to quarrel over mere questions of perspective. But it does seem to this reviewer that the authors have not brought their thinking quite up to date on their special devils—the British Tories, on "balance of power" and on "isolationism." However great the capacity for mischief of the Tory, it must be said, out of national pride if nothing else, that this country of ours can show groups with tremendous talents along similar lines. As for "balance of power," wasn't its historic meaning abandoned by Mr. Chamberlain? And hasn't it in its new incarnation of anti-Russianism come to live here with us? Messrs. Eden and Cranbourne are Tories, but at Mackinac and in some reaches of the State Department, aren't they viewed as veritable bolsheviks because of their addiction to the idea of post-war organization in coöperation with the USSR? In accepting "isolationism" at its face value, one overlooks its positive implications and its potentialities for counter-revolution on a world scale. To cite one example—with the Spanish embargo, supposedly an "isolationist" manifestation, we actively *intervened* on the side of Franco, and the groups that sponsored and maintained the embargo knew it. At the time of the Russian attack on Finland we saw how many of them were interventionist at heart. As Mr. Hoover said, neutrality can be as dynamic as war. Appeasement wasn't an end in itself

[1] What to Do with Italy, by Gaetano Salvemini and George La Piana. New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce. 301 pages. $3.50.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but a means to an end, a world delivered from democratic and libertarian influences and thus sound of heart and limb for the great crusade on bolshevism. When isolationism and appeasement cease to serve your ends you resort to other means—even to war. The day may come when free peoples everywhere will pray for a truly "isolationist" America that—if we are unwilling to throw our weight on the side of freedom in an organized peace— would at least leave the peoples of Europe alone.

The authors of "What to Do with Italy" know this very well, but say it by indirection. Perhaps this is out of respect for the animal necessity to preserve *some* illusions. For it is far from pleasant to have to contemplate the mounting evidence that the defeats suffered all along the line at home in these years by liberal, democratic and intelligently conservative forces were definitive defeats, that they were inflicted by elements that now seem to be predominant and whose increasingly counter-revolutionary character can hardly be disputed.

There are doleful notes in this otherwise lively, courageous book at the end, when the authors, "old teachers in an American university," speak of seeing the young men they had hoped to train "for life and constructive work" go off to war. "The mistakes of politicians and statesmen have born bitter fruits; these boys are now fighting for an ideal; to maintain in America and to revive in Europe the democratic way of life. Will the men of the older generation who have in their hands the conduct of the war and the settlement of the peace continue in their blunders? We fervently hope not. We cannot bear to think that these boys shall have died in vain."

But very grim are the passages in which they try to forecast the post-war behavior of the Vatican if confronted with a democratic republic in Italy and a decision to separate Church and State:

> Pope Gregory the Great said long ago that the events of the past are a sure promise of those of the future. If this be true, then it is not difficult to decide what the Vatican will do. Unless a miraculous change of heart takes place . . . we may be sure that the new Italian regime will have to face the hostility of the official Church. The Vatican will do again what it did in 1870; it will take the attitude that it is the innocent victim of Italian anti-religious groups bent on destroying the Church. The popes will start all over again to protest against the Italian regime, denouncing its domination by Free Masonry, or by communism, and calling the whole world to witness how the Church in Italy, deprived of all its rights, faces persecution and martyrdom.
>
> If the governments of the victorious nations will keep out of Italian affairs, and if the President and the State Department of the United States do not set themselves up as a kind of new Swiss Guard for the protection of the Vatican and its claims, the separation of Church and State in Italy would be a lasting solution to this problem.

Of course one could say that *if* in the post-war world a democratic Italian republic and others were allowed to come into being, there would have already taken place the "miraculous change of heart" not only in the Vatican but in many other quarters.

The *ifs* are many. Both as to the future conduct of the war and the nature of the post-war—the nature and the duration. Like the authors of this book, one can know all this and still hope and work and fight *now* for a better fate after victory, but one can nevertheless keep in mind an old Milanese saying with which Professors Salvemini and La Piana are no doubt familiar. "*Se mia nonna aveva le ruote io andrei in carrozza,*" which comes out more or less, "If my grandmother had wheels (four, one supposes) I could ride forth in a carriage."

JAY ALLEN

The Past Recaptured

The Land of the Great Image, by Maurice Collis. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 265 pages. $3.

THIS DEEP AND STRANGE BOOK—the story of Sebastião Manrique, a seventeenth-century Augustinian friar and his journey to Arakan on the Bay of Bengal, land of the Mahamuni, or great image of Buddha—is really a study of church and state, with applications private and political, for twentieth-century behavior.

"Strengthened by 'the stimulus of pressures,' the Portuguese irruption into Asia was a continuation of the crusade against the Moors," says Mr. Collis—this interpretation recalling Sir Francis Bacon's observation that civil wars are like the heat of fever; foreign wars are like the heat of exercise.

In this account, based on Manrique's "Travels," published in 1649 and other true sources, "Golden Goa" on the west coast of India, is depicted as gruesome Goa, with its "fidalgos, slaves, murders, adulteries, poisonings and ignorance"; of a piece with "the spectral hall" in the black stone palace of the Inquisition, which "selected its victims and concocted a process afterward," in the manner of the Gestapo.

A main and significant emphasis is placed on private and political defeat through "pride, idleness, luxury and vice." With power of becoming "invisible, invulnerable to hurt by men or spirits," King Thiri-thu-dhamma "surrendered to paranoia, a sign that he would not long remain on his throne." "A Buddhist king who, forgetting the compassion and sanity of the Eightfold Path, opened his mind to the evil suggestions of a wizard and murdered his subjects to obtain occult powers, had lain down with monsters, and because he had looked into the abyss, the abyss looked into him." That self-ensorceled sixteenth-century king became a prototype of twentieth-century Japan. A Buddhist nation has "conceived . . . the task of rescuing Asia . . . from being divided . . . among the . . . nations of the West," "discarding for the moment" the "Buddhist way of virtue" in order to make herself "invulnerable and invisible," and has "looked to secret weapons" . . . at "a moment when the nations of Europe fell upon one another."

Mr. Collis draws attention to the fact that "the British invaded Burma in 1825 by the same route they have taken today"; and as we follow Friar Manrique's journey to Arakan, through "mountains full of tigers"—"the track hard to find"—the trees infested with ants, through country in which "three hundred inches of rain may fall between May and October," our Allied fliers' defiance of the monsoon cannot but be in our minds.

As a study of "the Brahmic vision"—defined in terms other than Emerson's—this book is unforgettable. It is also

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one to which no curioso could be indifferent. With uncanny verisimilitude, it demonstrates how the power of suggestion may be augmented by "tattooing in squares"; by "hearing *taran*" (chance remarks); by vibrations from the great Yattara bell—"not sounded as a warning but as an occult offensive." A vanished world is made graphic in its reverences, costumes and generosities. We see a pair of newly captured young elephants "taking up sugar-cane in their trunks in a glad greedy way," and "elephants endorsed with towers" in a coronation procession; Manrique observing, "There is no animal which better graces a parade than an elephant, with its stately walk and lofty mien. Here were four hundred elephants, each decked till it was a pageant in itself, an ambling treasury of color. . . . And the elephants differed in character. . . . Yet fierce or mellow, they were equally disciplined, as they came on, two by two"—"dancers . . . crying out their names . . . the Victorious, the Master of Thunder, the Van Lord. And the great beasts were as tame as dogs . . . an expression of indulgence on their antediluvian masks."

A Dublin-born Oxford civil servant sent to Burma in 1912 and there for twenty-one years, Mr. Collis retired in 1936 by reason of his close sympathy with the Burmese. How, "under the present wave of belief in right conduct," he asks, "will America comport herself when paramount in Asia?" And shall we indeed have that dreamed-of universal state which in the sixteenth century, Goa and Rome were unable to achieve? MARIANNE MOORE

Two Views of America

American Heroes and Hero-Worship, by Gerald W. Johnson. New York: Harper and Brothers. 284 pages. $3.
American Political Parties: Their Natural History, by Wilfred E. Binkley. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 407 pages. $3.75.

GERALD JOHNSON's "American Heroes and Hero-Worship" is not, as the title might suggest to the unwary, a treatise on the subject or a series of studies integrated by a theory of history á la Carlyle. On the contrary, it is a group of essays on "The Ever-Changing Past," du Pont de Nemours, Hamilton and Jefferson, Van Buren and Clay, William Henry Harrison, Tom Watson, Bryan and Theodore Roosevelt, and Woodrow Wilson. It suggests the conversation of a witty and civilized liberal-minded conservative or conservative-minded liberal who has been attracted to the ironies of American history and the national character. It is very much of a piece in that the method and the mind are reflected in the style, which is gracefully old-fashioned in its antitheses, repetitions and subdued rhetorical flourishes.

Mr. Johnson's chapters on du Pont, Harrison and Watson are excellent presentations of minor figures. The chapter on Watson, embodying as it does the parallels in the careers of such Southerners as Vardaman, Tillman, Cole Blease, Tom Heflin and Huey Long, leads to one of the most interesting of Mr. Johnson's generalizations: "For fifty years every Southerner who has attained national stature in politics has been a conservative, or else disreputable." But the entire discussion of the post-Civil War South is conducted without adequate recognition of the direct connection between the section's unresolved economic and moral problems and the bumper crop of Watsons and Longs.

Too often Mr. Johnson's ironies turn out to be mere irrelevancies. Thus the chapter on Hamilton and Jefferson attempts to reverse the unimportant semantic verdict that the former was a "realist" and the latter an "idealist." The moral of the piece on Van Buren and Clay is that both the "politician" and the "statesman" were eliminated from political life "for stepping out of the character assigned to each by an inscrutable and grimly humorous destiny"—the instances being Van Buren's refusal to favor immediate annexation of Texas in 1844 and Clay's disgraceful straddling of the issue. Quite naturally, it follows that the supposed victories of Roosevelt over Bryan were not triumphs at all, since the social reforms and the anti-scientific fundamentalism of the Great Commoner have survived, with the belated aid, it must be added, of TR. I confess I am unable to follow Mr. Johnson's effort to find an irony—"a terrific jest"—in the repudiation of Wilson "by the American people." It is neither humorous nor entirely accurate to say "afraid of a new order created by Wilson, we intrusted its making to Hitler!" The stream of history is too broad to be covered by the neat little bridge of Mr. Johnson's generalization.

What remains? A good deal of information and not a few challenging comments. If it lacks the solidity of Herbert Croly's "The Promise of American Life" and A. M. Schlesinger's "New Viewpoints in American History," Mr. Johnson's book incites one to think about our national experience—even though he seldom asks quite the right questions.

Prof. Wilfred E. Binkley has asked many of these questions in his "American Political Parties: Their Natural History," the winner of the Alfred A. Knopf 1942 Fellowship in History. He has "sought to ascertain and account for the social or group composition of each of our major political parties" and "to discover the part played by national political leaders in building these great group combinations and how they learned and practised the art of 'group diplomacy.'" On the whole his account of American politics from the Federalists to the present is excellent. He has distilled the results of modern researches into a relatively short book that is accurate factually and shrewdly democratic in its analyses.

A point for point comparison of Mr. Johnson's judgments on personalities and his historical generalizations with those of Professor Binkley reveals the gulf between the essayist and the historian. What interests Mr. Johnson most about Cleveland is his honesty and his courage; Professor Binkley grants that Cleveland was "honest, conscientious and courageous," but is more interested in exploring the fact that in Cleveland's second term "during four depression years the United States was a magnificent police state utterly oblivious of distress either rural or urban." This has too often been the fruit of honesty and courage when unaccompanied by social intelligence and imagination.

Mr. Johnson's references to the Reconstruction era are in the moth-eaten tradition that struck bottom with "The Birth of a Nation." Professor Binkley, on the other hand, has not been afraid to draw on the work of Du Bois and Simkins to conclude that "the fundamental achievement of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Republican combination of carpet-baggers, scalawags and Negroes had been a social revolution in the interest of the underprivileged which the restoration of Southern home rule certainly did not completely undo."

In contrast to the conversational tone of "American Heroes and Hero-Worship," the voice that speaks in "American Political Parties" is that of the platform-lecturer. But the man behind the voice is as at home at the political hustings as he is among the archives, and the flavor of each —the sweat of the politicos and the dust of the stacks—is in his book.

Its chief merit, however, is as a readable synthesis of recent scholarship. His publishers do him no service, then, when they say that he "offers some rather surprising views: Lincoln as the pliant politician; Hanna as the friend of labor; Hayes as the proper victor in the disputed election; Coolidge's professional silence as a positive principle." These views would hardly appear surprising to A. J. Beveridge, Herbert Croly, P. L. Haworth and William Allen White, respectively, who long ago "offered" them, as Professor Binkley has scrupulously recorded in his footnotes. Indeed, they would come as no surprise to the historical figures involved, since it was they who first insisted on them.

GEORGE MAYBERRY

India Today

The Problem of India, by R. Palme Dutt. New York: International Publishers. 224 pages. $2.

ON SEPTEMBER 10, 1942, Mr. Churchill assured the House of Commons that "The situation in India at this moment gives no occasion for despondency or alarm." All the popular leaders of India were then in jail. Since then, crowds have been machine-gunned from the air, there have been cases of collective fines and public flogging for political offenses. Since then, the English Chief Justice declared the arrests of Gandhi, Nehru and others invalid. The Viceroy merely passed another ordinance, and made them valid by retroaction. These arbitrary measures in India by Britain, a champion of democracy, must continue to give occasion for despondency and alarm.

We need more authoritative books on India for informed judgment. Here is one. The present volume is a condensed summary of Mr. Dutt's earlier book, "India Today," with the story brought up to date. Here, in compact form, the reader will find the essentials of one of the most timely and provocative topics of our times—the British in India. Here, in a few pages, is compressed a wealth of information covering such varied topics as the nature of British imperialism in India; India's unity and divisions; the rise of the Nationalist, the Socialist and the labor movements; India's potential wealth and actual poverty; the Cripps Mission and its aftermath; and, finally, constructive suggestions for the breakdown of the deadlock in India.

Those Britishers and others who contend that Britain no longer derives any economic gain from her political hold on India will find little comfort in these pages. Relying mostly upon British sources, Mr. Dutt advances and carefully builds the thesis that despite the advance of Indian capital, British capital remains in effective monopolistic domination of banking, commerce, exchange and insurance, of shipping, of the railways, of the tea, coffee and rubber plantations and of the jute industry. In iron and steel, Indian capital has been forced to come to terms with British capital. Even in cotton textiles, through the managing-agency system, Britain exercises enormous control.

In analyzing the causes of India's appalling poverty, Mr. Dutt brings out significant yet little known facts. Between 1870 and 1910, the rate of growth of population in India was less than that of any European country, with the exception of France; only since 1921 has the rate of increase been higher than that of England and the Western European countries. However, it has not outstripped the increase in the production of foodstuffs and raw materials, which increased 30 percent against a 19-percent increase in population between 1900 and 1930. The root cause of poverty, according to Dutt, is the British economic grip that has deliberately thwarted India's industrial and economic growth.

On the political side, the author stresses the fact that in spite of the constitutional concessions to India, the ultimate and real control always remained with Britain. It was

HAVE YOU DISCOVERED

Kierkegaard?

Of course you know his name, but have you *read* him? Soren Kierkegaard has been soberly compared to Socrates, Pascal, Nietzsche, Tolstoy, Augustine, Freud, Tertullian, and William James (to give only part of the list).

TIME MAGAZINE: "Had this philosopher and mystic not written in a minor language, his fame would have resounded with that of Carlyle, Nietzsche, and Dostoevski."

MIGUEL UNAMUNO: "I learned the language in order to read Ibsen and was rewarded by reading Kierkegaard."

REINHOLD NIEBUHR "The profoundest interpreter of the psychology of the religious life, in my opinion, since St. Augustine."

COMMONWEAL: "The greatest Protestant Christian of the nineteenth century, a man equal in spiritual stature to Cardinal Newman."

CHRISTIAN CENTURY: "Kierkegaard has inspired all those philosophers and theologians of the recent past who have concerned themselves with the doctrine of man."

These are the ten Princeton Kierkegaard publications:

PHILOSOPHICAL FRAGMENTS, *translated by David F. Swenson. (Published for American-Scandinavian Foundation)* $2.00

STAGES ON LIFE'S WAY, *translated by Walter Lowrie.* $6.00

CONCLUDING UNSCIENTIFIC POSTSCRIPT, *translated by David F. Swenson and Walter Lowrie. (Published for American-Scandinavian Foundation)* $6.00

THE SICKNESS UNTO DEATH, *translated by Walter Lowrie.* $2.75

REPETITION, *translated by Walter Lowrie (with a bibliographical essay, "How Kierkegaard Got into English").* $2.75

FEAR AND TREMBLING, *translated by Walter Lowrie.* $2.75

EITHER/OR, *translated by David F. Swenson, Lillian M. Swenson, and Walter Lowrie. 2 vols. (Publication late fall 1943)* $7.50

THE CONCEPT OF DREAD, *translated by Walter Lowrie. (Publication spring 1944)*

THE ATTACK ON "CHRISTENDOM," *translated by Walter Lowrie. (Publication spring 1944)*

A SHORT LIFE OF KIERKEGAARD, *by Walter Lowrie.* $2.75

Order from your bookseller or from

THE PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS

PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

true of the 1935 constitution, and this was the reason for the failure of Cripps. Mr. Dutt criticizes the Indian National Congress for pursuing a barren and "catastrophic" policy of civil disobedience, but assails the British Tories for driving the Indian Nationalists to these very measures and pleads for the breakdown of the deadlock, so that India's vast resources may be thrown against fascism.

This reviewer cannot always agree with Mr. Dutt's Marxian overtones, but finds his central thesis unassailable and his treatment admirable. ANUP SINGH

Pre-Paid Medicine

Kaiser Wakes the Doctors, by Paul de Kruif. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company. 158 pages. $2.

THIS BOOK is a description of the plan for prepaid medical care at the Kaiser shipyards on the Pacific Coast. This is not socialized medicine, unless life insurance is socialized saving. By charging all members of a large group of workers 50 cents a week whether sick or well, it is possible to give all of them, without added expense, high-quality medical and hospital care, including the services of a group of specialists who work together as a team in a clinic. As is well known, the American Medical Association has fought such plans savagely. In part, the Association may have been motivated by the (unjustified) fear that poor medical care would result; but mostly, the AMA seems to have been responding to a real or imagined economic interest. The story of what it did—and tried to do—to Kaiser is not a pretty one.

Mr. de Kruif's enthusiasm runs high, and his style is rather flamboyant at times, but his book is a tract to be used as propaganda in an important fight that is just beginning and perhaps his tone is more valuable for the purpose than a cooler, more scientific approach would have been. B. B.

A Reader's List

THE HIDDEN ENEMY: The German Threat to Post-War Peace, by Heinz Pol (Messner, $3). Pol warns us against two fallacies: that Hitler and a handful of Nazi leaders alone are wicked, the German people idealistic, God-fearing, virtuous, *gemütlich*, etc., and that 80,000,000 Germans to a man are fiends in human shape. Blueprints for Hitlerism at its worst are found in propaganda of the Pan-German League, particularly Heinrich Class; in harmony with the doctrines of the General Staff and the Junkers. (André Chéradame has been denouncing the same elements for thirty years.) The argument is well conducted, with a great deal of sober information, but is, of course, not the whole truth. Pol, still an orthodox German, does not go to the fountainheads, Frederick II and Bismarck. He makes proposals for a deliberate, limited but drastic purge.

THE END OF THE BEGINNING: War Speeches (January-December, 1942), by the Right Hon. Winston S. Churchill. Compiled by Charles Eade (Little, Brown, $3.50). Laud would be wasted on the Old Master. He is Shakespearean. He is British Tradition incarnate, John Bull *in excelsis*, the Man of a People. He is the perfect parliamentarian, shrewd and courteous, with an iron hand. He is at his best in his great reports to the House of Commons on the war situation: then orator and audience are attuned to a miraculous perfection. The ancestral voices of Pitt, Canning, Palmerston, Disraeli reëcho in rich undertones. But never forget that he is so perfect because he is limited.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA IN EUROPEAN HISTORY, by S. Harrison Thomson (Princeton, $3.50). The editor of the Journal of Central European Affairs has written a much-needed history of the "geographical entity lately known" by the name of Czechoslovakia. Since the inhabitants themselves possess an unusual degree of historical self-awareness, an understanding of the problems of this crucial region must be based on a knowledge of their development from the early origins in the fifth century and the subsequent cumulative complications. Mr. Thomson has made the structure of the present clear by tracing the tangled ethnic strands and the lines of the political and national ideologies. A full delineation of the economic background would have completed the picture, but this might perhaps have interfered with a successful simplification of an inordinately dense mass of material.

THE BASIC TEACHINGS OF THE GREAT ECONOMISTS, by John W. McConnell (The New Home Library, 69 cents). The usual academic history of economic thought, with its chronology of writers, dates and imposing bibliography, often appears quite forbidding to the layman. The lay reader will not meet these hurdles in Professor McConnell's history. With the obvious intention of making the development of ideas, rather than the succession of writers, the center of attention, his book gives a topical treatment of the history of economic doctrine. Written eruditely, though without ostentation, and clearly presenting some of the more abstruse contributions, Professor McConnell rapidly surveys the development of the concepts of wealth and income, value and price, rent, wages, capital and interest, money, business cycles, taxation and economic planning. Despite the brevity of some of the discussion, there is sufficient detail to make clear for the layman the growth of economic ideas. Nor is Professor McConnell afraid of showing the impact of social conditions on economics. A useful biographical appendix completes the book.

Contributors

JEFFERSON B. FLETCHER has been a professor of Comparative Literature at Columbia University for the past forty years, and is the author, among other books, of a translation of "The Divine Comedy" and "Literature of the Italian Renaissance."

G. I. is an enlisted man in the United States Army.

JAY ALLEN, formerly a foreign correspondent, has spent many years covering all parts of Europe, notably France, Italy, Spain and North Africa.

MARIANNE MOORE was editor of The Dial from 1925 to 1929. She is the author, among other books, of "What Are Years," and has contributed verse and criticism to The Nation, The Kenyon Review, Life and Letters, Poetry and The New Republic.

ANUP SINGH was born in India and received his doctorate in Political Science at Harvard. He is the director of the Research Bureau of India League of America, editor of India Today and has lectured widely in the United States and Canada. Dr. Singh is the author of "Nehru: The Rising Star of India" and has contributed to Amerasia, Harpers, The New Republic and other periodicals.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED